

A COMPARISON OF MORAL REASONING AND MORAL ORIENTATION OF
AMERICAN AND TURKISH UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

Nilay Ozkan Kuyel, B.S.

Thesis Prepared for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS

August 2002

APPROVED:

Rebecca J. Glover, Major Professor and Chair
Arminta Jacobson, Committee Member
Barbara K. O'Donnel, Committee Member
Linda Schertz, Program Coordinator for Development,
Family Studies, and Early Childhood Education
Michael Altekruze, Chair of the Department of
Counseling, Development, and Higher Education
M. Jean Keller, Dean of the College of Education
C. Neal Tate, Dean of the Robert B. Toulouse School of
Graduate Studies

Kuyel, Nilay Ozkan, A comparison of moral reasoning and moral orientation of American and Turkish university students. Master of Science (Development and Family Studies), August 2002, 148 pp., 15 tables, references, 102 titles.

This study compares American and Turkish male and female university students in terms of moral orientation (justice and care) and Kohlberg's stages of moral reasoning to examine the influence of culture and gender on moral development. A total of 324 undergraduate students between the ages of 18 and 46 are administered the Defining Issues Test (DIT) and the Measure of Moral Orientation (MMO). Statistical analyses indicate Turkish participants reflect more postconventional reasoning, while American participants reflect more conventional reasoning, particularly Stage 4 reasoning. Analyses also reveal Turkish participants reflect significantly more care orientation and more justice orientation compared to American participants. These findings are discussed in terms of cultural and gender influences in moral decision-making.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would first like to thank my advisor, Rebecca Glover, for her guidance, support, and friendship during the course of my graduate studies. I also thank her for many invaluable discussions which played a key role in this research. This study would not be possible without her time and effort.

I would like to thank my committee members: Arminta Jacobson and Barbara O'Donnel for their time and effort in reviewing and evaluating this study. I would also like to thank Feyza Doyran, Ufuk Özdağ, Osman Özdağ, Melike Bağlı, Figen Çok, and my brother, Kubilay Özkan for their help during the data collection process in Turkey.

Finally, I would like to thank my husband and my mother for their incredible support during my graduate studies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	ii
LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
 Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	1
Review of the Literature.....	6
Definition of Terms.....	6
Kohlberg's Cognitive-Developmental Theory of Moralization	7
Mature Moral Judgment.....	8
The Prerequisites of Moral Judgment.....	10
Cognitive Development.....	10
The Development of Perspective-Taking...	11
Kohlberg's Research Technique.....	13
Levels and Stages of Moral Judgment.....	16
Invariant Sequence of Stages.....	21
Kohlberg's Longitudinal Study of	
Moral Judgment in U.S. Males.....	21
Kohlberg's Studies in Other Cultures.....	23

Kohlberg's Longitudinal Study in Turkish Males.....	24
Kohlberg's Longitudinal Study in Kibbutz Adolescents.....	24
Kohlberg's Studies in Taiwan and Mexico.....	25
Research Findings on Kohlberg's Theses.....	26
Invariant Sequence.....	26
Research Findings in the U.S.....	26
Cross-Cultural Findings.....	26
Snarey's Review.....	27
Moon's Review.....	29
Gielen's Review.....	30
Relations Among Cognitive, Role-Taking, and Moral Development....	32
The Structure of Moral Judgment.....	33
Moral Action.....	34
Characteristics of the Moral Stages.....	36
Criticisms on Kohlberg.....	40
Turiel's Claim.....	40
Alternative Forms of Postconventional Moral Reasoning.....	44

Gilligan's Theory of Feminine Morality.....	48
Gilligan's Research Technique.....	48
Gilligan's Three Levels of Moral Reasoning.....	49
Gilligan's Summary of Her Observation Results....	51
Gilligan's Claim of Two Different Moral Domains	53
Focus Phenomenon.....	54
The Link Between Selfhood and Morality.....	55
The Origins of the Orientations of Justice and Care	56
The Development of Different	
Moral Orientations of Two Genders.....	57
The Signs of Justice and Care Perspectives in	
Boys and Girls During Middle Childhood.....	59
The Psychological Development of Girls and	
the Emergence of the Care Perspective.....	60
Differences During Adulthood.....	63
Gilligan's Thoughts on the Coexistence of	
Justice and Care.....	63
Research Findings on Gilligan's Theses.....	65
Differences in Moral Orientation.....	65
Research Findings in the U.S.....	65
Research Findings in Other Cultures	67
Differences in Moral Reasoning.....	69

Research Findings in the U.S.....	70
Research Findings in Other Cultures	71
Criticisms on Gilligan.....	72
Miller’s Claim.....	72
Turiel’s View on Childhood Relationships.	74
Kohlberg’s Claim.....	75
The Comparison of Justice and Care Perspectives.....	76
Social Structure and Gender Equality in Turkey.....	80
Purpose of the Study.....	83
Hypotheses.....	84
2. METHODOLOGY.....	86
Sample.....	86
Instruments	88
The Defining Issues Test	88
The Measure of Moral Orientation	92
Procedures.....	95
3. RESULTS.....	96
The Analyses of the DIT.....	96
The Analyses of Hypothesis 1.....	96
The Analyses of Hypothesis 2.....	99
The Analyses of Hypothesis 3.....	100
The Analyses of Hypothesis 4.....	100

The Analyses of the MMO.....	102
The Analyses of Hypotheses 5 and 6.....	102
4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION.....	105
Discussion.....	105
Limitations of the Study and Suggestions for Future Research	124
Suggestions for Future Application.....	125
Conclusion.....	126
APPENDIX A: Consent Form, Demographic Questionnaire, and Instruments	128
APPENDIX B: Kohlberg's Stages.....	139
REFERENCES.....	140

LIST OF TABLES

Table		
1.	T-Test Results for Hypothesis 1.....	98
2.	T-Test Results for Hypothesis 2.....	99
3.	T-Test Results for Hypothesis 3.....	100
4.	ANOVA Results for Hypothesis 4	101
5.	ANOVA Results for Hypothesis 5.....	103
6.	ANOVA Results for Hypothesis 6.....	104
7.	Results of Oneway ANOVA for Stage 4.....	111
8.	Results of Oneway ANOVA for Stage 5A.....	112
9.	Results of Oneway ANOVA for Stage 5B.....	113
10.	Results of Oneway ANOVA for Stage 3.....	115
11.	Results of Oneway ANOVA for P-score.....	119
12.	T-Test Results of Justice and Care Orientations for Turkish Males.....	123
13.	T-Test Results of Justice and Care Orientations for U.S. Males.....	123
14.	T-Test Results of Justice and Care Orientations for Turkish Females...	124
15.	T-Test Results of Justice and Care Orientations for U.S. Females.....	124

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Gender differences and gender bias are important and controversial issues in moral theory (Kurtines & Gewirtz, 1995). Gender difference in moral development can be defined as the difference in the moral perspectives of man and woman due to the difference in their rearing, while gender bias in moral development can be defined as the favoring of one gender's moral reasoning over the other.

The issue of gender differences in moral functioning has been a discussion subject for a long time. "Historically, women and men have often been accorded and claimed to have different moral qualities and, not infrequently, differential moral worth" (Kurtines & Gewirtz, 1995, p. 23). In ancient ethical texts, "justice was seen as the moral virtue that organized all other virtues and balanced them in proper, relative proportions" (Puka, 1994, p. 321). Therefore, up to the 20th century, almost all philosophers saw man as the competent moral agent in that he acts rationally in the solution of social conflicts by assuming justice as the basic issue. Conversely, woman was seen as the incompetent moral agent in that she is unsuccessful in doing so (Walker, 1998).

Contemporary moral development theories also gave priority to realization of justice in social life. Moral maturity required for applying justice was equated with the capacity for autonomous thinking, the ability to judge by logical reasoning, and the

detachment that gives rise to objectivity. Further, these properties were associated with masculinity, as was the case throughout history. Women's development was seen as distinctive and problematic as it did not reflect the standards of men (Gilligan, 1982). The source of this problem was associated with women's development being dependent on the experience of relationships and emotion more than reason, as well as their inability to abstract from the particularity of situations. Consequently, they were viewed as not being autonomous and not being able to act impartially in their moral decisions (Hekman, 1995).

For example, according to Freud (as quoted in Gilligan, 1982), "women show less sense of justice than men that they are less ready to submit to the great exigencies of life, that they are more often influenced in their judgment by feelings of affection or hostility" (p. 7). Similarly, Piaget pointed out (as quoted in Gilligan & Wiggins, 1988) "the most superficial observation is sufficient to show that in the main the legal sense is far less developed in little girls than in boys" (p. 113). In addition, Erikson said the development of women was different from that of men, but he showed little interest in defining this difference (Hekman, 1995). Therefore, both pre-20th century philosophers and contemporary development theoreticians viewed men's moral reasoning as superior and mature (Walker, 1998), and saw women's moral reasoning as inferior, ethically undeveloped, immature, and childlike (Koehn, 1998).

Gender differences in Kohlberg's stages of moral reasoning caused the emergence of the most salient controversy regarding gender bias in moral theory (Kurtines & Gewirtz, 1995). Kohlberg, who was influenced by ancient ethical texts and

especially by Piaget's ideas (Puka, 1994), defended cognition as the foundation of morality, and separation and objectivity were bases for moral maturity (Eisenberg, Miller, Shell, McNalley, & Shea, 1994). Kohlberg's theory showed the sequence of an individual's moral development followed a six-stage progression. Higher stages represented moral maturity, in other words, justice reasoning. Kohlberg, for long years, studied both women's and men's progressions in these stages and statistically concluded more women reasoned at lower stages compared to men (Held, 1993). In other words, he found men to be more morally advanced with respect to women (Gilligan, 1995).

Gilligan (1982) opposed these findings about women and Kohlberg's interpretation of them. According to Gilligan, women's lives and experiences are distinct from men's, and the moral voices of two sexes spring from separate developmental sources. Therefore, women experience a moral development different from but parallel to that of men (Meyers & Kittay, 1987). Women value behavior and emotions such as caring for others, having interdependent relationships, being responsive to the needs of others, sympathy, compassion, and love, which do not constitute a basis for traditional moral development theories. Consequently, they give preference to such behavior and emotions in moral issues, instead of justice (Gilligan).

According to Gilligan (1982), traditional developmental theoreticians, especially Piaget and Kohlberg, ignored this distinction in woman's development, and they tried to observe the woman from the perspective of male life in adult development. In other words, these theoreticians built their moral theories on the norms of

masculinity. Therefore, the woman who has different social and moral development is seen as a “failure” in terms of development by these theoreticians who consider male norms, such as independence and autonomy, as mature adult standards.

Gilligan (1982) believed these theories were inadequate, male-biased, and incomplete as they did not include women’s experiences. Thus, Kohlberg’s stages of moral reasoning did not adequately reflect the morality of girls and women. His theory and scoring system measured only justice reasoning and did not represent the characteristically feminine concerns for caring and responsiveness (Walker, 1994). Because women use care reasoning as the guide for moral decisions, it was normal for them not to score highly in measurement instruments designed for measuring justice reasoning. But, this did not mean woman was morally less advanced (Gilligan).

The discussion between Kohlberg and Gilligan on cognition-emotion has drawn attention to moral emotions (Eisenberg et al., 1994), and research on this subject flourished after the 1980s (Shweder & Haidt, 1994).

Women and men live, to some extent, in different social environments. They experience different social expectations and different opportunities (Gilligan, 1982). According to cognitive developmental theories, moral development depends on experience (Gardner, 1983). If so, can different moralities develop from different experiences? Researchers sought an answer to this question by providing an overview of theory and research regarding the issue of sexism in moral psychology. As pointed out by Walker (1995), “at the center of the contemporary controversy regarding sex differences and sex bias have been the theories of Gilligan and Kohlberg” (p. 83).

Therefore, moral development researchers focused their studies especially on Kohlberg's research to investigate if "gender bias in favor of males" existed in his theory, as Gilligan claimed.

Even though Gilligan states that race and culture also influence moral reasoning, she claims justice and care orientations are basically linked to gender (Hekman, 1995). However, many researchers believe "Gilligan insightfully identified a missing voice in Kohlberg's theory, but inappropriately primarily linked it to gender rather than culture" (Kurtines & Gewirtz, 1995, p. 24). According to Miller (as cited in Turiel, 1998), "variations in judgments about interpersonal obligations and justice reflect cultural, and not gender, differences" (Turiel, 1998, p. 895).

Based on the existing literature, this study is an attempt to assess the significance of cultural and gender differences on moral development. To test the influence of culture and gender on moral development, the Defining Issues Test (DIT) (Rest, 1986) and the Measure of Moral Orientation (MMO) (Liddell, Halpin, & Halpin, 1992) are applied to both male and female from the U.S. and Turkey. The DIT provides a quantitative assessment of a participant's probabilistic usage of each of Kohlberg's stages 1 through 6 (Ma & Cheung, 1996). The MMO, on the other hand, measures a participant's moral orientations for care as stressed by Gilligan, or justice as stressed by Kohlberg (Liddell et al.). In this research, DIT score differences between male and female populations are compared to the DIT score differences between Turkish and U.S. populations to assess the significance of cultural and gender differences on moral reasoning, and MMO score differences between male and female populations are

compared to MMO score differences between Turkish and U.S. populations to assess the significance of cultural and gender differences on moral orientation.

This thesis has 4 chapters. In Chapter 1, Kohlberg's and Gilligan's moral theories will be reviewed in detail and research findings and criticisms on their fundamental theses will be summarized. Next in Chapter 1 is brief information on the social structure and gender equality in Turkey. This information on social structure and gender is needed to analyze the results of this study. Purpose of the study and listing of the hypotheses conclude Chapter 1. In Chapter 2, the details on the Turkish and U.S. samples are given together with the details of the instruments used in this research. In Chapter 3, the findings of this cross-cultural study will be reported. In Chapter 4, the results of this study will be discussed and compared to existing research summarized in Chapter 1.

Review of the Literature

Definition of Terms

Moral Judgment: “deciding which of the possible actions is most moral. The individual weighs the choices and determines what a person ought to do in such a situation” (Narvaez & Rest, 1995, p. 386).

P-score: The percentage of a participant's overall moral reasoning which represents postconventional reasoning (Stages 5A, 5B, and 6, combined) as defined by Kohlberg's theory (Gielen & Markoulis, 1994).

The Ethic of Justice: treating “people fairly by identifying and fulfilling rules, principles, rights, and duties” (Liddell et al., 1992, p. 326)

The Ethic of Care: responding “to people in a way that ensures that the least harm will be done and that no one will be left alone” (Liddell et al., 1992, p. 326)

Moral Orientation: preference for justice- or care-oriented moral reasoning (Yacker & Weinberg, 1990)

Kohlberg’s Cognitive-Developmental Theory Of Moralization

Moral psychology, through empirical studies, attempts to define what moral development is and moral philosophy tries to explain what moral development ideally ought to be (Kohlberg, 1982). Kohlberg is one of the very few psychologists who combined work in moral psychology and moral philosophy (Kutnick, 1986). In fact, he integrated psychology, philosophy, and educational practice to establish a comprehensive explanation of moral growth and a model for moral education (Hersh, Miller, & Fielding, 1980). He was greatly influenced by the cognitive revolution in developmental psychology which took place in the 1960s, and carried this revolution to moral development literature (Kurtines & Gewirtz, 1995).

Cognitive developmental theories concentrate on the reasoning presumed to underlie morality. They are interested in the qualitative form of the individual’s moral reasoning and in developmental changes in that reasoning (Colby, Kohlberg, & Kauffman, 1987). Following Piaget, they try to uncover stages in the development of moral understanding. The main contribution of Kohlberg has been to apply the concept of stage to the development of moral judgment (Hersh, 1979). It can be said that Kohlberg pioneered the field of moral development, and his theory shaped the field as it evolved (Kurtines & Gewirtz, 1995).

Mature Moral Judgment

A value is a “concept about what someone thinks is important in life” (Fraenkel, 1977, p. 6). Morality can be thought of in terms of the values acquired from the social environment. Therefore, an individual can be seen as having values, and a moral person is expected to act on these values. What happens when a person’s values conflict with one another? How does s/he decide which value to follow? Kohlberg was interested in the moral issue which takes such questions into consideration and which involves individuals’ exercising their moral judgments (Hersh, 1979).

For example, what should a woman who believes abortion is wrong, but who is having an unwanted pregnancy, do? In her state, the law is in favor of abortion. Similarly, her feminist friends encourage her to control her own life and have the abortion. Her spouse tends to favor the abortion for certain reasons; however, her parents think she should not have an abortion for nonmedical reasons. In this case, the woman is subject to contradictory opinions based on different values. How is she going to decide what to do? According to cognitive moral development theorists, she has to choose between these two rights in order to come to a moral decision: (a) the right of the fetus to life, or (b) the right which leads to her own happiness and welfare (Hersh, 1979).

Based on his studies in the U.S. and in other cultures, Kohlberg (1976) concluded there were 11 basic moral values found in every society: “laws and rules; conscience; personal roles of affection; authority; civil rights; contract, trust, and justice in exchange; punishment and justice; the value of life; property rights and values; truth;

sex and sexual love” (Kohlberg, 1976, p. 43). According to Kohlberg, when a person faces a moral dilemma which includes a conflict between such moral values, s/he has to weigh the competing claims of these values and decide which value ought to take precedence. For example, what value ought to take precedence over the preservation of human life? Should law take precedence? Should an individual break a law to protect a life? Should property take precedence? Should an individual sacrifice her/his property to protect someone’s life? Should conscience take precedence? Should an individual sacrifice a point of conscience (e.g., displaying violence) to preserve a life? Should roles of affection take precedence? Should an individual sacrifice her/his close relationship with an old friend to save a life? Should contract take precedence? Should an individual save a person’s life with whom s/he has no contract of mutual responsibility (Hersh, 1979)?

Kohlberg claims that as a person’s moral judgment grows more adequate, he will be able to differentiate the value of life from all other values and see that it should take precedence over them. He will also see that saving a person’s life is what ought to be done, independent of whether he feels like it or whether other people would be likely to do the same. (Hersh, 1979, p. 91)

According to Kohlberg, as the mature moral thinkers respect human life, they support individual rights, and base their moral decisions upon a concept of justice (Rich & DeVitis, 1985).

The Prerequisites of Moral Judgment

Cognitive Development

As mentioned before, the cognitive developmental tradition played an important role in the emergence of the moral development field (Kurtines & Gewirtz, 1995).

Piaget and other cognitive developmental theorists believe infants' and children's understanding is different from adults'. Children are not yet able to perceive and organize experiences as an adult. Instead, they move through a series of developmental stages until they reach the highest level of functioning (Sugarman, 1987).

After the child learns to speak, s/he passes through 3 major stages of reasoning: the preoperational, the concrete operational, and the formal operational (Kohlberg, 1982). In each stage, the individual interprets and responds to her/his environment in a qualitatively different way. In the preoperational stage (2-7 years), young children's mental actions do not obey logical rules. Their understanding is perception-bound, their thinking is centered, and their focus is on states rather than transformations. They cannot establish a cause and effect relation. They believe other people perceive, think, and feel the same way they do. In the concrete operational stage (7-11 years), children can classify things, look at situations from different perspectives, see quantitative relations about concrete things, and make logical inferences. However, they can only reason logically about concrete, tangible information, not about abstract information. In the formal operational stage (11 years and older), young people can reason abstractly

and use hypothetico-deductive reasoning. Therefore, when faced with a problem, they can think of all possibilities, form hypotheses, and test them in an orderly fashion against reality (Sugarman, 1987).

According to Kohlberg, the exercise of moral judgment is a cognitive process that allows individuals to reflect on their values and organize them into a logical order. As mentioned before, the most advanced moral reasoners believe the value of life and the equality of human rights take precedence over all other values (Hersh, 1979), and they try to resolve conflicts in ways that would result in justice (Koehn, 1998). Kohlberg (1976) points out advanced moral reasoning depends on advanced logical reasoning. Therefore, mature moral judgment, which represents justice reasoning, requires full formal operational reasoning as a base.

The Development of Perspective-Taking

Kohlberg defines moral judgment as the weighing of one's own claim against the other's. The individual can weigh her/his own claim against the other's only if s/he can take the other's perspective and understand the other's claim (Hersh, 1979). Therefore, according to Kohlberg (1976), the development of moral judgment depends on the advances in perspective (role) taking skills as well as on cognitive development. Moral growth occurs when the individual becomes aware of perspectives beyond the immediate self (Galbraith & Jones, 1976).

Perspective-taking skills develop gradually from about the age of 6 (Hersh, 1979). As the child becomes cognitively mature, s/he also becomes better able to perceive and combine various points of view regarding a moral conflict and to consider

more of the relevant situational factors (Colby, Kohlberg, & Kauffman, 1987).

Therefore, each new cognitive stage improves the individual's role-taking capacity and moves her/him closer to basing moral decisions upon a concept of justice (Rich & DeVitis, 1985).

For example, a person whose cognitive stage is only preoperational is limited to moral stage 1 as s/he cannot yet distinguish the perspectives of others from her/his own. S/he sees only her/his own perspective. A person whose cognitive stage is concrete operational is limited to moral stage 2. S/he has the capacity to view her/his own thoughts, feelings, and behavior from the other person's perspective. S/he also recognizes that others can do the same. Thus, s/he can predict how other people will react to her/his behaviors and can plan her/his actions accordingly. A person whose cognitive stage is only partially formal operational is limited to the conventional moral stages (Stages 3 and 4). The individual, in the early formal operational stage, can step outside a two-person situation and view the interaction from the point of view of a third, impartial party. Taking a third-party perspective is crucial for the development of moral judgment as it allows the individual to understand how the group will react to her/his dealings with others. Only the people who have full formal reasoning can display postconventional reasoning (Stages 5 and 6). Postconventional reasoners recognize third-party perspective taking can be affected by larger societal values and mutual perspective-taking does not always result in complete understanding (Hersh, 1979). In a moral conflict situation, they can put themselves in the place of the various people involved and truly understand their claims and interests. Consequently, they can

generate moral judgments on which all rational men involved in sociomoral action could ideally agree, and their decisions are recognized as fair by all the conflicting people involved (Kohlberg, 1994).

Kohlberg (as cited in Turiel, 1998) views the child as a moral philosopher. According to him,

children form ways of thinking through their social experiences which include substantive understandings of moral concepts like justice, rights, equality, and welfare. An implicit but important assumption in this formulation is that morality is not solely, or even mainly, imposed on children nor solely based on avoiding negative emotions like anxiety and guilt. As part of their orientation to social relationships, and especially through taking the perspectives of others children generate judgments, built on emotions like sympathy, empathy, respect, love, and attachment, to which they have a commitment and which are not in conflict with their natural or biological dispositions. (Turiel, 1998, p. 867)

Kohlberg's Research Technique

Kohlberg (1976), for long years, studied how people think about social and moral problems. He started his research with the assumption that people restructure their reasoning about moral situations just as they develop their cognitive (logical) structure from concrete reasoning toward one more abstract in nature (Galbraith &

Jones, 1976). Then, he interviewed 72 middle-class and lower-class American boys (ages 10, 13, and 16) in suburban Chicago to study the development of moral reasoning (Hersh, 1979).

His Moral Judgment Interview (MJJ) consists of 3 hypothetical dilemmas. In each dilemma, a character who is in a difficult situation is expected to choose between two conflicting values. Each dilemma is read to the participant and several probing questions are presented. More specifically, the participant is asked how the main character ought to solve the dilemma “and why that would be the right way to act in this situation” (Hersh, 1979, p. 54). Each dilemma includes a different moral issue. One of the dilemmas in Kohlberg’s MJJ is as follows:

In Europe, a woman is near death from a special kind of cancer. There is one drug that the doctors think might save her. It is a form of radium that a druggist in the same town has recently discovered. The drug is expensive to make, but the druggist is charging ten times what the drug cost him to make. He paid \$200 for the radium and is charging \$2000 for a small dose of the drug. The sick woman’s husband, Heinz, goes to everyone he knows to borrow the money, but he can get together only about \$1000 which is half of what it costs. He tells the druggist that his wife is dying and asks him to sell the drug cheaper or let him pay later. The druggist says, “No, I discovered the drug and I am going to make money from it.” Heinz is desperate and considers breaking into the man’s store to steal the drug for his wife.

1. Should Heinz steal the drug? Why or why not?
2. If Heinz doesn't love his wife, should he steal the drug for her?
Why or why not?
3. Suppose the person dying is not his wife but a stranger. Should
Heinz steal the drug for a stranger? Why or why not?
4. [If you favor stealing the drug for a stranger]: Suppose it is a pet
animal he loves. Should Heinz steal to save the pet animal? Why
or why not?
5. Why should people do everything they can to save another's life,
anyhow?
6. It is against the law for Heinz to steal. Does that make it morally
wrong? Why or why not?
7. Why should people generally do everything they can to avoid
breaking the law, anyhow?
- 7a. How does this relate to Heinz's case? (Hersh, 1979, p. 54-55)

In this dilemma, the competing issues are life and law (Lapsley, 1996). In other words, the participant is expected to choose between the value of preserving life and the value of upholding the law. The probing questions are designed to elicit the participant's understanding of these two issues. The researcher is not interested in if the participant thinks Heinz should or should not steal the drug. Instead, s/he focuses on the participant's reasons for choosing one value over the other. In the second dilemma, the conflicting values are conscience (e.g., whether to forgive a person who broke the law

out of conscience) and punishment (e.g., whether to punish a person who broke the law). The third dilemma focuses on an issue including a conflict between authority (e.g., obeying one's parent) and the importance of promise-keeping and contract (e.g., abiding to an agreement). The participant's consistent reasoning across a range of moral dilemmas determines her/his level of moral judgment (Hersh, 1979).

On the basis of American boys' responses to these hypothetical moral dilemmas, Kohlberg specified six developmental types of value orientations: "obedience and punishment; naively egoistic; good boy; authority and social-order maintaining; contractual legalistic; conscience or principles" (Kurtines & Greif, 1974, p. 270). These types constituted the basis for the six stages of moral judgment.

Levels and Stages of Moral Judgment

Kohlberg (1976) divided the 6 stages of moral judgment into 3 levels: preconventional, conventional, and postconventional. These 3 levels represent 3 different ways of relating the self to society's moral expectations (Lapsley, 1996). There are two stages in each level. "The second stage is a more advanced and organized form of the general perspective of each major level" (Kohlberg, 1976, p. 33). Each stage has a different and more comprehensive perspective on society, right action, and the concept of justice (Hersh et al., 1980).

Preconventional Level

Individuals in this level approach a moral problem from the perspective of the concrete interests of the people involved in a situation. Therefore, they judge actions by their consequences. Behaviors that cause punishment are seen as bad, whereas those

that result in rewards are viewed as good (Hersh, 1979). The preconventional level is characteristic of young children under 9, some adolescents, and criminal offenders (Kohlberg, 1976).

Stage 1: heteronomous morality

Individuals in this stage have an egocentric point of view. They do not recognize others can have interests or perspectives which are different from theirs (Kohlberg, 1976). Moral rules and norms are seen as something imposed by authority figures, not something that is constructed from the inside. The moral significance of authority figures is defined physicalistically. Individuals in this stage think people who are rich, big, and famous have more valid claims to justice and greater moral authority than people who are poor, small, and not famous. Stage 1 individuals behave morally because they know they will be punished if they break the rules (Lapsley, 1996).

Stage 2: individualistic, instrumental morality

Individuals in this stage have a concrete individualistic perspective. They understand everybody has different interests to pursue and these conflict. Therefore, right is seen as relative (Kohlberg, 1976). Stage 2 reasoners obey the rules as long as it is to their own immediate interest. In this stage, reciprocity is not yet a matter of loyalty, gratitude, or justice (Kohlberg, 1994). It is seen as a way to satisfy personal needs (e.g., “If you help me, I’ll help you”). Thus, justice is viewed as equal exchange of favors (Lapsley, 1996). Right action is defined as satisfying personal needs (without unduly harming anybody else) and as letting others do likewise (Walker, 1994).

Conventional Level

In the conventional level, the self is identified with the rules of others, especially those of authority figures (Hersh, 1979). The conventional level represents a rule-maintaining orientation, whatever the rules may be (Rest, 1997). Morality is viewed as behaving according to what society defines as right. Therefore, individuals in this level approach a moral issue from a member-of-society perspective (Hersh). They continue to conform to cultural norms and rules, but not for reasons of self-interest. They believe they should keep the current social system to ensure positive human relationships and societal order. For this reason, they see norms and conventions as necessary to uphold society. The conventional level is characteristic of most adolescents and adults (Kohlberg, 1976).

Stage 3: interpersonal normative morality

In this stage individuals have the informal group perspective as they take the perspective of people close to them (e.g., family, peer groups, relatives). They are aware of the shared feelings, agreements, and expectations, and those shared feelings take primacy over their own individual interests (Locke, 1994). Moral choices depend on close ties to others (Kohlberg, 1994). Stage 3 reasoners display good behavior to be able to keep the affection and approval of friends and relatives. Therefore, right action is viewed as playing a good role, caring for other people, and meeting others' expectations (Locke). Intentions become important for the first time in judging behaviors (Kohlberg).

Stage 4: social system morality

At this stage, individuals have a formal group perspective. In other words, they consider the generalized social system perspective. They obey the law in order to ensure social order and maintain the welfare of society (Walker, 1994). Stage 4 reasoners define right behavior as doing one's duty, showing respect for authority, and keeping the social order for its own sake (Kohlberg, 1994).

Postconventional Level

Postconventional individuals approach a moral issue from a prior-to-society perspective (Hersh, 1979). Postconventional reasoners, like individuals at the conventional level, also want to be a responsible member of society, but have a perspective for rule-making – a vision for how social order should optimize human welfare and enhance cooperation (Rest, 1997). They define morality in terms of self-chosen principles rooted in the concept of justice. This level is the rarest and usually attained after the age of 20 (Kohlberg, 1976).

Stage 5: human rights and social welfare morality

Stage 5 reasoners are aware individuals have a variety of values and opinions, and they recognize most values and rules are relative to their own group. They uphold these rules and values as they constitute the social contract. They believe such nonrelative values and rights as life and liberty, however, should be upheld in any society regardless of majority opinion (Niemczynski, Czyzowska, Pourkos, & Mirski, 1994). Stage 5 individuals have both moral and legal points of view, and they know these two points of view sometimes conflict (Kohlberg, 1976). They follow laws when

they are consistent with human rights. When the existing laws are questionable, they emphasize fair procedures for changing the law (Kohlberg, 1994). However, their moral perspective is not independent of the perspective behind contractual-legal rights (Kohlberg, 1976).

Stage 6: universal ethical principles

In this stage, “right is defined by the decision of conscience in accord with self-chosen ethical principles appealing to logical comprehensiveness, universality, and consistency” (Kohlberg, 1994, p. 4). Stage 6 reasoners base their decisions on principles of universal justice: the equality of human rights and respect for the dignity of individuals (Kohlberg, 1976).

To summarize, in Kohlberg’s (1981) theory, morality shifts away from concrete, externally controlled reasoning toward more abstract, principled justifications for moral choices from late childhood into adulthood. According to Kohlberg, the structure of thought is the primary consideration for determining an individual’s moral progress; however, at the highest two stages content is also relevant. In other words, at the highest two stages moral reasoning and content are integrated into a coherent ethical system. Therefore, morally mature individuals not only agree on “why” certain actions are justified, but also agree on “what people should do” when faced with a moral dilemma.

Invariant Sequence of Stages

Kohlberg's Longitudinal Study of Moral Judgment in U.S. Males

According to Kohlberg (1981), the stages progress in an invariant sequence. In other words, individuals pass through the stages in the prescribed order. As mentioned before, Kohlberg started his empirical research by interviewing a group of American boys. On the basis of their responses to a series of hypothetical dilemmas, he initially identified six stages in the development of moral judgment. This study was cross-sectional; in other words, participants were interviewed only once, and age trends were found by comparing boys of different ages. Kohlberg realized, however, that to be able to prove his assumption of the invariant sequence of stages, he would have to interview the same participants over time to find out if each participant passed through the stages in the same order (Hersh, 1979).

Motivated by this belief, Kohlberg interviewed 50 of the boys who participated in his original study at regular 3—4-year intervals for 20 years. Half of the participants was upper middle-class and half was lower middle and working-class. Kohlberg interpreted the results of this research as consistent with the stage model of development. In fact, his study showed no participant reached a stage without having passed through each preceding stage. In other words, there was no evidence of stage skipping. The level of moral maturity consistently increased with increasing age. In fact, most 10-year-old participants were observed to be at Stage 1/2 or 2. Most early adolescents (13-14) were at Stage 2/3. Half of the late adolescents was found to be at Stage 3. Participants in their early 20s were either in transition between Stages 3 and 4

or still at Stage 3. Most participants between the mid-20s and mid-30s displayed Stage 3/4 mixtures, “with decreasing numbers at Stage 3 and increasing numbers at consolidated Stage 4” (Colby, Kohlberg, Gibbs, & Lieberman, 1987, p. 101). There was no evidence of Stage 5 until age 24 (Colby, Kohlberg, Gibbs, et al.).

Social class was observed to be important, especially in the development of Stages 4 and 5. Results showed more middle-class participants attained both Stage 4 and the postconventional 4/5 level compared to working-class participants. Social class differences in rate of moral development were attributed to “differential participation in and identification with the society and its secondary institutions” (Colby, Kohlberg, Gibbs, et al., 1987, p. 113). It has been stated this differential participation provides differential perspective-taking opportunities for children from middle and working classes. Middle-class children experience being integral participants in the society and, therefore, obtain the generalized social system perspective which represents Stage 4 (Colby, Kohlberg, Gibbs, et al.).

The correlation between moral judgment stage and education was moderate ($r = .54$). No participant attained Stage 4 without having attended some college, and none of the participants obtained the 4/5 level without having completed college. According to Kohlberg, this finding does not mean that college experience is always required for the development of Stage 4 or Stage 5; however, the correlation implies educational experience stimulates the development of higher stages (Colby, Kohlberg, Gibbs, et al., 1987).

Based on his longitudinal research in U.S. males, Kohlberg asserted the results provided strong support for the central assumptions of his theory (Colby, Kohlberg, Gibbs, et al., 1987).

Kohlberg's Studies in Other Cultures

Kohlberg believes “stage sequences are not only invariant across individuals within a particular culture or subculture but are also culturally universal” (Colby, Kohlberg, & Kauffman, 1987, p. 9). Cultural relativists, on the other hand, view morality as a concept relative to the culture. They believe moral values and behaviors differ from society to society (Gielen & Markoulis, 1994). Kohlberg acknowledges there is moral diversity among cultures. However, according to him, “the differences lie in the stage of moral development of individuals and cultures and in the meaning, use, and hierarchical ordering of value concepts. These cultural divergencies are not only found in the knowledge base but in the principles used in moral evaluations” (Rich & DeVitis, 1985, p. 93). Even so, individuals in every society, Kohlberg asserts, pass through the same sequence of moral development as all cultures use the same basic moral concepts or principles (Rich & DeVitis). “Cultural factors may speed up, slow down, or stop development, but they do not change its sequence” (Colby, Kohlberg, & Kauffman, 1987, p. 6).

To establish the cross-cultural validity of his moral stage theory, Kohlberg conducted studies examining the development of moral reasoning in children and adolescents in Turkey, Israel, Taiwan, and Mexico. Only the studies in Turkey and Israel were longitudinal (Hersh, 1979).

Kohlberg's Longitudinal Study in Turkish Males

In Turkey, data were collected from male participants ($n = 109$) in three locations: a rural village, a seaport provincial capital, and the national capital. Participants from the village consisted of students in the local school, young workers, and young men who had recently finished their military service. Participants from the cities included elementary school, high school, and college students or young workers. All city participants were middle-class. Participants (ages 10 to 28) were interviewed in 1964, 1966, 1970, and 1976. The results indicated a sequential advance with age through the stages of moral reasoning. There was no evidence of stage skipping (Nisan & Kohlberg, 1982).

Participants under 18 years of age tended to display a mixed rather than a pure stage. After this age, however, participants, especially village boys (56.3%), showed a tendency to stabilize at Stage 3. Only 35% of the city participants older than 18 showed pure Stage 3 responses. Additionally, 45% of the city participants in the oldest age group displayed Stage 4 development, whereas only 12.5% of the village participants in the same age group showed any sign of Stage 4 reasoning (Nisan & Kohlberg, 1982). Among the college students there was a sizable usage of Stage 5 judgment (Turiel, Edwards, & Kohlberg, 1978). Nisan and Kohlberg concluded the rate of moral judgment development was slower in the village than in the city.

Kohlberg's Longitudinal Study in Kibbutz Adolescents

The Israeli sample came from a Kibbutz community, an intentionally created, highly integrated society reflecting a socialist-collectivist ideology (Gielen, 1996). The

sample included both Kibbutz-born and Middle Eastern Israeli adolescents and adults (78 males and 56 females – ages 12 to 26). The results showed change in moral reasoning was consecutive, gradual, and upward. No participant skipped a stage. The level of moral reasoning consistently increased with increasing age. The Kibbutz mean stage scores at all ages were found to be higher than the mean stage scores in the U.S. and Turkey. There were no significant sex differences in stage scores (Colby, Kohlberg, Snarey, & Reimer, 1987).

Kohlberg's Studies in Taiwan and Mexico

Kohlberg studied boys between 10 and 16 years of age in Taiwan and Mexico and in an isolated village in the Yucatan. The development of middle-class boys from cities in Taiwan and Mexico was similar to that of American middle-class boys from ages 10 to 16. Taiwanese and Mexicans were observed to use Stage 1 at age 10; however, by age 16 they, too, displayed conventional moral reasoning predominantly. The development of village boys in the Yucatan reflected the same sequence of stages; however, their rate of development was much slower. Yucatan boys, like village boys in Turkey, tended to stabilize at Stage 3 (Hersh, 1979).

According to Kohlberg, the results of the studies in Turkey, Israel, Taiwan, and Mexico were consistent with the structural understanding of the development of moral judgment and provided strong evidence for his theory's universality claim. Stages 4/5 and 5, however, were relatively rare and none of the village participants in Turkey and Yucatan reached Stage 5 (Colby, Kohlberg, Snarey, et al., 1987).

Research Findings on Kohlberg's Fundamental Theses

Invariant Sequence

Research Findings in the U.S.

In the 1960s and 1970s, many studies were conducted in the U.S. to test Kohlberg's hypothesis of the invariant sequence, and most of these studies yielded support. For example, Denney and Duffy (1974) investigated the environmental causes of stages in moral judgment in 6-year-old, 10-year-old, and 14-year-old children. As a result of their study, they observed that as the age of the children increased, the level of moral judgment used by children also increased. Participants did not display stage skipping. In 1989 Walker (as cited in Walker, 1996) did a 2-year longitudinal study with 233 children, adolescents, and adults. There was no evidence of stage skipping.

Cross-Cultural Findings

Today, there are more than 120 cross-cultural studies available conducted to evaluate Kohlberg's claim of cultural universality. These studies especially relied on two methods: Kohlberg's Moral Judgment Interview (MJII) and Rest's Defining Issues Test (DIT) (Gielen, 1996). The MJII was widely used, and the reliability and validity of the MJII were demonstrated to be very good. However, its scoring system was found to be quite complicated. Rest's Defining Issues Test is a more accessible measure in comparison with the MJII (Walker, 1996). For this reason, it is the most frequently used moral judgment measure in the moral development literature (Gielen).

As mentioned before, the MJII is a production test designed to elicit participants' best reasoning. The DIT, on the other hand, is a recognition-preference test that aims to

learn respondents' evaluation on moral arguments (Gielen, 1996). The MJI is interested in the qualitative assessment of the structure of moral reasoning, while the DIT is more interested in the quantitative assessment of a participant's probabilistic usage of each of Stages 1 through 6 (Ma & Cheung, 1996).

The DIT studies constitute the primary focus of this thesis. However, in order to assess how the DIT results can be related to the MJI results, brief information on cross-cultural studies using the MJI will also be presented. Snarey (1985), Moon (1986), and Gielen and Markoulis (1994) reviewed cross-cultural studies conducted to test Kohlberg's claim of cultural universality. Their reviews can be summarized as follows:

Snarey's Review

Snarey (1985) reviewed 45 cross-cultural studies (including Kohlberg's studies) completed in 27 different cultures. These studies were conducted using Kohlberg's Moral Judgment Interview (MJI). Longitudinal research results came from the following countries: Bahamas, Canada, India, Indonesia, Israel, Turkey, and the U.S. Cross-sectional studies were carried out in the following countries: Bahamas, Canada, England, Finland, Germany, Guatemala, Honduras, Hong Kong, India, Iran, Israel, Japan, Kenya, Mexico, New Zealand, Nigeria, New Guinea, Pakistan, Puerto Rico, Taiwan, Thailand, U.S., Yucatan, and Zambia.

As a result of his review, Snarey (1985) concluded the Moral Judgment Scale used in all cross-cultural studies was reasonably culture fair as dilemmas reflected the local culture and most participants were interviewed in their native language. His

review showed there was no stage skipping in both cross-sectional and longitudinal studies. The modal stage and the upper limits of the stage range increased with increasing age.

Stages 1 to 4 were virtually universal; however, there was little evidence of Stages 5 and 6. Stage 4/5 or 5 was commonly present when age was controlled. A total of 100% of the urban Western samples and 91% of the urban non-Western societies displayed Stage 4/5 or Stage 5 reasoning. However, these stages were absent in village folk societies, both Western and non-Western (Snarey, 1985). For example, consistent with Kohlberg's observations in a Turkish village, Edwards (1986), in her Kenyan study, also observed adults who had never left their villages used primarily Stage 2 and Stage 3 moral judgments, while adults who had high-school education displayed some Stage 4 judgment. Adults who had university-level education, on the other hand, displayed Stage 4 and Stage 5 judgments. According to Edwards, Stage 3 is a sufficient level of reasoning in communities having face-to-face relationships. This situation does not necessitate differentiation and integration beyond Stage 3. Based on the general findings of these 45 studies, Snarey suggested the significant difference lay not between Western versus non-Western societies, but between folk versus urban societies.

In all studies the level of moral reasoning increased with increasing age and education, consistent with Kohlberg's findings. Upper middle or middle-class participants were higher in the level of moral reasoning with respect to lower-class or working-class participants (Snarey, 1985). As the MJI was developed primarily based upon longitudinal data from the U.S., researchers might expect especially high maturity

scores for U.S. groups. However, in comparison with the scores of the other samples, the American moral maturity scores were about average (Gielen, 1996). The data from three collectivistic cultures—Taiwan, Israeli Kibbutz, and India—showed the samples from these countries scored higher than even upper middle-class Americans in one or more age divisions, and Turkish urban participants ranked higher than working-class participants in the U.S (Snarey).

Among the groups of younger participants, the Chinese samples received the highest moral judgment scores. In other words, Chinese children displayed conventional moral reasoning at a much earlier age compared to their age peers (Gielen, 1996). Stage 4 first appeared among 4 Taiwanese high-school students. Similarly, Stage 4/5 was first observed in an 18-year-old Taiwanese adolescent (Snarey, 1985).

Based on his review, Snarey (1985) concluded findings of studies in these widely differing societies strongly supported the existence and invariant sequence of Kohlberg's moral stages.

Moon's Review

In 1986 Moon reviewed 20 cross-cultural studies completed in 15 countries: Australia, Brazil, Greece, Hong Kong, Iceland, India, Israel, Japan, Korea, Mexico, the Philippines, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Taiwan, and Trinidad and Tobago. These studies were conducted using the DIT (usually a translated version of the DIT).

As a result of his review, Moon (1986) observed samples reflecting the characteristics of American culture received the highest P-scores. In fact, American

participants' P-scores were higher than their counterparts in Mexico, Japan, and Saudi Arabia. Similarly, English adolescents scored higher P-scores than their Greek age-mates. There was a strong positive relationship between the P-score and age/education in various cross-cultural studies. However, the rate of development was different for the Western (Americans) and non-Western participants (Koreans and Chinese). The DIT studies indicated the older and better educated the non-Western participants were, the more they lagged behind their American counterparts. The Eastern participants' P-scores were either higher or close to those of their American age-mates in their junior high school years. However, as they got older and more educated, the increase in their P-scores slowed down. In general, education was observed to be more important than chronological age in the development of moral reasoning.

Based on these studies, Moon (1986) concluded the cross-cultural results were similar to American findings and Kohlbergian findings and, therefore, the DIT had cross-cultural validity in identifying moral reasoning structures and their development in other cultures.

Gielen and Markoulis's Review

Gielen and Markoulis (1994) reviewed 15 studies employing the DIT in 14 different cultures. The data were taken from the following populations: Australia, Ireland, USA, Greece, Poland, Belize, Trinidad-Tobago, Hong Kong, South Korea, Taiwan, Sudan, Kuwait, Egypt, and Nigeria.

Gielen and Markoulis's (1994) review showed in all studies not completed in Arab countries P-scores consistently increased with increasing age and education level.

The older and better educated participants supported the postconventional arguments more frequently than the younger and less educated participants. Among high school participants, the highest scores were reported for Taiwan, South Korea, and Hong Kong, a finding consistent with Lei's result that younger students from Taiwan scored unusually high on the MJI. North American, European, and the East Asian college and university students received similar P-scores. Participants from less developed countries such as Belize, Nigeria, and Trinidad-Tobago scored lower than participants from the more industrialized nations in Europe, North America, and East Asia. Based on this finding, Gielen and Markoulis suggested the significant difference lay between industrialized Western or East Asian countries with better educational systems and less industrialized countries with less educational opportunities, not between Western, Anglo-Saxon, English-speaking countries and non-Western, non-English-speaking countries.

According to Gielen and Markoulis (1994), their review demonstrated Kohlberg's stages were universal. In other words, the researchers argued the understanding of and the preference for postconventional moral reasoning seemed to develop in East Asian, European, and North American cultures. However, studies in Egypt, Kuwait, and Sudan did not show clear developmental trends. The majority of participants from these countries did not pass the standard consistency tests included in the DIT. Furthermore, the samples did not show a significant correlation between P-scores and age/education. Therefore, according to Gielen and Markoulis, the DIT might not be a satisfactory measure of moral judgment for Arab societies.

Relations Among Cognitive, Role-Taking, and Moral Development

Kohlberg (1976) claims “just as there is a vertical sequence of steps in movement up from moral stage 1 to moral stage 2 to moral stage 3, so there is a horizontal sequence of steps in movement from logic to social perception to moral judgment” (p. 32).

Researchers found results supporting Kohlberg’s assumption about dependent relations among the logical, social-cognitive, and moral domains (Lapsley, 1996). For example, Walker and Richards (as cited in Lapsley) observed participants did not reach moral Stage 4 without obtaining “early basic” formal operations as a prerequisite. Selman (1971) investigated the relationship between role-taking skill and moral judgment in middle childhood. He applied Kohlberg’s moral judgment measure, two role-taking tasks, and the PPVT Test to 60 middle-class children. As a result of his study, he observed reciprocal role-taking was a necessary condition for the development of conventional moral judgment. Similarly, in 1980 Walker (as cited in Walker, 1996) applied measures of cognitive, perspective-taking, and moral reasoning development to a group of children. Results showed most children were more advanced in cognitive and perspective-taking development than in moral development, and only less than 2% displayed higher maturity in moral development than in the other domains. In the same study Walker, through an experimental intervention, tried to force moral reasoning development as a function of attainment of prerequisites in both cognitive and role-

taking domains. His intervention resulted in stimulating moral development to the next stage only for those children who obtained the cognitive and perspective-taking prerequisites.

The Structure of Moral Judgment

Kohlberg (1981) states that not the decisions but the reasons underlying these decisions are important in resolving moral problems. Therefore, his focus is on the structure of moral judgment (general organizing principles of thought) rather than specific moral beliefs. In other words, he is interested in the form of reasoning rather than the specific and culturally variable content of the moral decisions as it is the form that shows developmental regularity and generalizability within and across people (Colby, Kohlberg, & Kauffman, 1987).

According to Kohlberg, the structure of an individual's reasoning represents her/his "real" thinking. In real-life conflict situations, individuals use the same stages or forms of reasoning they use in resolving hypothetical dilemmas in the MJI (Hersh, 1979). DeMersseman (as cited in Hersh) found results supporting this assumption. DeMersseman observed children between 4 and 9 years of age used the same stages of reasoning in both real-life and hypothetical dilemmas. Walker, de Vries, and Trevethan (1987) asked subjects to respond to the MJI and to remember and discuss a real-life moral dilemma they experienced. The findings showed consistency in moral stage between responses to real-life and hypothetical dilemmas. The correlation between the

Weighted Average Scores for the two types of dilemmas was highly significant ($r = .83$). The results of these studies imply there is a strong consistency in people's moral reasoning.

Moral Action

Kohlberg points out individuals' moral behaviors are affected primarily by situational factors rather than by the values they adopt. In fact, in general, most individuals who say cheating is wrong tend to cheat in experimental conditions if they believe the risk of detection is low. If there is a high risk of detection, however, they are less likely to cheat. Then, perceived risk rather than espoused values is influential on individuals' actions (Hersh, 1979).

Kohlberg believes, however, higher-stage reasoners are less likely to be affected by situational factors and they tend to act consistently on their values. Krebs (as cited in Blatt & Kohlberg, 1975) tested this assumption with sixth-graders. He gave 120 junior high school students from both working and middle-class families several experimental cheating tests and then interviewed them using the MJI. The results showed 73% of the preconventional participants cheated on one or more of the tests, 66% of the conventional participants cheated, whereas only 20% of the postconventional participants cheated. Malinowski and Smith (as cited in Lapsley, 1996) reported similar results. Their study showed individuals who reason at the higher stages of moral judgment were less likely to cheat even if there was a low risk of detection. McNamee (as cited in Lapsley) observed most participants at Stages 3 and 4 agreed it was proper to help a victim. However, Stage 4 participants were more likely to actually help the

victim with respect to Stage 3 participants, and Stage 5 participants were more likely to actually help the victim with respect to Stage 4 reasoners.

In 1997, Litvack-Miller, McDougal, and Romney examined the structure of dispositional empathy in middle childhood and its relationship to prosocial behavior. A total of 478 students from 2nd, 4th, and 6th grades completed an altruism questionnaire, a social desirability scale, and the Interpersonal Reactivity Index. Teachers were asked to rate the participants on such prosocial behaviors as sharing. As an experimental part of the research, the participants could make monetary donations and do volunteer work to raise funds. The findings showed only the children advanced in moral reasoning and empathic and perspective taking skills engaged in prosocial behavior. Carlo, Koller, and Eisenberg (1998) investigated prosocial moral reasoning in a sample of 116 Brazilian orphaned, institutionalized delinquent, and noninstitutionalized adolescents. The results showed delinquent adolescents were more likely to prefer lower levels of prosocial moral reasoning. Nondelinquent adolescents were more advanced in prosocial moral reasoning. They were more altruistic and honest, and they displayed prosocial behavior.

These research results support Kohlberg's (1981) claim that moral reasoning becomes more closely related to behavior at the higher levels of moral understanding. As individuals move up the stage hierarchy, they start realizing reasons are motives for behavior and they show a tendency to perform the action. In other words, at higher stages individuals become aware moral principles are prescriptive and that corresponding moral decisions are obligatory. Therefore, higher-stage reasoners are

more likely to see the self as responsible for acting upon a judgment. As pointed out by Lapsley (1996), “Stage 5 subjects should not only agree on the action to be taken (i.e., make the autonomous choice), but they should also be expected to follow through with whatever action this choice obligates them to take” (p. 84).

Characteristics of the Moral Stages

According to Kohlberg, moral stages represent qualitatively distinct ways of thinking. Individuals in Stage 2 and individuals in Stage 3 may share a similar value, but their way of thinking about the value is qualitatively different. In other words, even though the value is similar, the meaning of the value changes in each stage. Therefore, individuals’ modes of thinking and of solving the same problem are qualitatively different at different stages (Hersh, 1979).

Each stage forms a structured whole. When an individual enters a new stage, s/he does not simply modify selective responses. S/he restructures how s/he thinks about a whole series of moral issues (Hersh, 1979). This suggests an individual’s thinking reflects the same underlying logical capacity across a range of moral problems. Based on this assumption of the structure criterion, Colby, Kohlberg, Gibbs, et al. (1987) claim “an individual’s thinking will be at a single dominant stage across varying content, though use of the adjacent stage may also be expected” (p. 77-78). Researchers found evidence supporting Colby, Kohlberg, Gibbs, et al.’s assumption that individuals are either in a stage or in transition between stages. In 1988, Walker (as cited in Walker, 1996) reviewed the existing literature regarding consistency on the MJI and concluded 94% of participants’ reasoning was at the two adjacent stages and 66% of

their reasoning was at a single stage. Kohlberg, in his longitudinal study with Kibbutz adolescents, observed 83% of participants' reasoning was at one major stage or at two adjacent stages (Colby, Kohlberg, Snarey, et al., 1987).

Kohlberg points out stages are hierarchical integrations. Higher stages integrate the structures found at lower stages (Hersh, 1979). In other words, each higher stage incorporates the logical features of lower stages and addresses problems unresolved by lower stages (Kohlberg, 1981). Thus, according to Kohlberg (1994), a later stage's mode of judgment is morally more adequate than an earlier stage. For example, preconventional reasoners look at the facts and perspectives of other people from their own point of view. Whereas preconventional individuals focus only on the concrete interests of the people involved in a situation, individuals at the conventional level focus also on the interests of the group or society and people's feelings and expectations involved. Consequently, conventional reasoning can be said to be more adequate or better than preconventional reasoning as it takes into consideration more aspects or variables of a moral conflict. In the Heinz dilemma, for instance, while Stage 2 individuals would not even take into account the feelings and expectations of the wife or the obligation of Heinz as a husband, Stage 3 individuals would take into account these issues (Hersh).

Postconventional reasoning, on the other hand, is more adequate than conventional reasoning as it is a guide to action not a rule of action. Therefore, it provides people greater flexibility. For example, for individuals at the conventional level, abortion includes one of many moral issues about which an individual should

turn to her/his system of laws and beliefs in order to decide how to act. If her/his religious system is against abortion, then s/he may tend to abide by that ruling. If her/his political system is in favor of abortions, s/he believes they are allowable. But moral principles do not forbid abortion. Individuals at the postconventional level take into consideration the interests and rights of both the mother and the fetus and ask whose right in this situation should take precedence. There is no one correct solution for this dilemma. In each case individuals involved are supposed to weigh the problem in relation to their particular situation (Hersh, 1979).

Postconventional reasoning, then, is more advanced than conventional reasoning as it looks at a moral dilemma from the perspective of any human being, not from a member of a particular society, culture, or religion. Morally mature individuals see themselves as responsible for being primarily loyal to protecting individual rights and secondarily loyal to their own country as long as it supports human rights (Hersh, 1979). Candee (1976) interviewed 372 college students to study the relationship between the structure of moral judgment and specific moral choice. The results showed participants at each higher stage of moral structure more often made decisions that were consistent with human rights and less often made alternative choices that were related to maintain conventions. The findings of this study support Kohlberg's claim that at the postconventional level all people, given the same information, should reach the same answer.

According to Kohlberg, as it provides more logical, comprehensive, and more adequate solutions to moral problems, people tend to prefer the highest stage of

reasoning they can understand (Galbraith & Jones, 1976). In fact, Kohlberg (1981) observed when Stage 5 reasoners were exposed to Stage 6 arguments, they preferred Stage 6 arguments over Stage 5 arguments. Researchers found evidence consistent with Kohlberg's observation. For example, Turiel (as cited in Hersh, 1979) presented a sample of 7th grade American children with stage-related advice on how to solve a moral conflict. One-third of the children was given advice one stage below its present stage, a second third was given advice one stage above its present stage, and the last group was given advice two stages above its own stage of reasoning. Posttest results showed the group receiving advice one stage above its own stage was more changed by the advice with respect to the groups receiving the other kinds of advice.

Rest (as cited in Hersh, 1979) provided a list of responses to the Heinz dilemma to a sample of American adolescents. The list consisted of one answer at each of the 6 moral stages for why Heinz should or should not steal the drug to save his wife's life. The participants were expected to restate each answer by using their own words and rank the statements according to how good they were. As a result of his research, Rest observed the participants had a tendency to rank low all responses at stages lower than their own. They tended to restate responses at stages higher than their own in terms of their own stage and to prefer the response at one stage above their own to the response at their present stage.

Walker (as cited in Lapsley, 1996) measured children's moral reasoning, then, he exposed the children to moral reasoning either one (+1) or two stages (+2) above their own stage. Posttest results showed both +1 and +2 stage reasoning caused

movement toward the next stage. Even though +2 reasoning induced stage movement, it was assimilated in +1 terms. Therefore, the participants in both conditions displayed +1 change.

Criticisms on Kohlberg

Turiel's Claim

Turiel (as cited in Rest, 1997) does not agree with Kohlberg's claim that conventional morality precedes postconventional morality. Turiel asserts morality and social conventions are separate, different, and parallel domains of cognitive development, rather than a single system as assumed by Kohlberg. According to Turiel, children very early in life comprehend hitting a playmate (moral domain) is in a distinct domain from a boy wearing a skirt (social convention). The moral domain includes those behaviors that directly hurt or help other people, or treat others unequally. "Children observe the direct effects of their acts on others and formulate moral thinking accordingly. On the other hand, children come to realize that there are social rules that help to organize a society (forms of address, eating etiquette, sex-stereotyped behavior)" (Rest, 1997, p. 424). Then, according to Turiel (as cited in Shweder, Mahapatra, & Miller, 1990), morality represents objective obligations concerning harm, justice, and the well-being and rights of others. In other words, actions or events carry that moral quality if they "involve physical or psychological harm, personal or private property, promises or commitments, or the allocation of scarce resources" (Shweder et al., 1990, p. 153). Conventional actions, on the other hand, do not carry a moral quality as their rightness or wrongness is obtained solely by virtue of social consensus.

According to Turiel (as cited in Shweder et al., 1990), children develop the idea of a moral action and the idea of a conventional action and differentiate these two kinds of events from each other as they have had direct experience with both types of actions and have learned these are not the same. In fact, Turiel, Nucci, and Smetana (as cited in Shweder et al.) observed that 3- to 5-year-old children can discriminate moral rules from conventional rules and recognize moral obligations cannot be changed by group consensus, whereas conventional obligations are arbitrary, can be altered if the majority wants to alter them, and can vary from society to society. According to Turiel, these findings suggest children view moral transgressions as more generalizably wrong, independent of rules, and less permissible in comparison with conventional transgressions.

According to Rest (1997), Turiel's focus is on content, not on structure. He misconstrues what is meant by "conventional morality." Rest points out Kohlberg's stages are not characterized by lists of specific acts (e.g., hitting a playmate is wrong). Those are content issues each culture identifies in terms of concrete rules. Kohlberg does not define the moral stages in terms of specific prohibitions or prescriptions. Rather, he defines the stages "in terms of the fundamental rationale for what makes an act moral or immoral" (Rest, 1997, p. 425). In other words, in Kohlberg's theory specific rules (content) are distinguished from the underlying rationale for having rules (structure). Therefore, according to Rest, Kohlberg's moral stages concentrate on a completely different level of mental operations than does Turiel.

For this reason, Rest (1997) does not agree with Turiel's claim that morality and social conventions are separate domains. Instead, like Kohlberg, he believes principled morality succeeds conventional morality. According to Rest, the main evidence showing conventional reasoning develops before postconventional reasoning comes from the DIT which is a recognition test. Rest states "instead of having Kohlberg's problem with the rarity of principled thinking, the main index of the DIT is the "P" score—preference for Stages 5 and 6" (Rest, 1997, p. 427). Thus, the DIT provides the researcher enough opportunity to test whether postconventional morality developmentally follows conventional morality. Rest emphasizes the DIT has been used in over 1000 studies and data have been collected from over 100,000 participants, and many longitudinal, cross-sectional, intervention, and correlational studies with other developmental measures show conventional reasoning precedes postconventional thinking.

Based on their study, Shweder et al. (1990) also question Turiel's claim. Shweder et al., in their cross-cultural research of Indian (180 children and 60 adults) and American (180 children and 60 adults) populations, asked participants from both countries to judge how wrong each of 39 acts would be (e.g., whether it is wrong for a widow to wear jewelry and bright-colored clothes 6 months after the death of her husband or wrong to beat a disobedient wife). The researchers observed striking differences between the two samples in what they considered wrong. Shweder et al.'s research findings can be summarized as follows:

(a) in India, many of the social convention transgressions were considered more serious than the moral transgressions, (b) in India, the social conventions were not considered alterable or contingent, (c) the Indians did not make the distinction between the moral and the social conventional domains that Turiel said is universal—instead, the Indians said their social conventions should be obeyed universally, (d) young Indians were like older Indians, young Americans were like older Americans. (Rest, Narvaez, Bebeau, & Thoma, 1999, p. 167-168)

Shweder et al.'s (1990) research showed the idea of convention (e.g., conventional obligations are consensus-based, relative to one's culture, and alterable) occurred almost exclusively in the reasoning of American adults and older American children (it did not exist among American children under age 10). American children and adults reflected the democratic belief that "any collection of like-minded individuals is free to construct for themselves their own design for living, as long as other differently minded individuals are free to exit and form their own society" (Shweder et al., 1990, p. 160). However, as mentioned above, Hindu participants did not reflect the idea of convention. They saw their practices as direct expressions of natural law. Whereas Americans reflected the idea of convention and became more relativistic in their judgments as they aged, Indians showed a greater tendency to regard their practices as universally moral, binding, nonrelative, and unalterable (Shweder et al.).

Based on the results of their research, Shweder et al. (1990) claimed morality and social conventions were not different domains universally. The researchers observed the idea of convention had relatively less importance in everyday understandings of obligations. The idea of universal moral obligations appeared to be more widely distributed across ages and cultures in comparison with the idea of conventional obligations. These findings led the researchers to conclude the emergence of reasoning based on conventional obligations was a culture-specific development.

Alternative Forms of Postconventional Moral Reasoning

After Kohlberg's cross-cultural finding that relatively few people around the world display genuine postconventional reasoning, moral development theorists started questioning the underlying interpretive logic of his theory (Shweder et al., 1990).

From Shweder's point of view, Kohlberg's notion of only one universal developmental pathway for morality is ethnocentric and uninformed about cultural differences. Shweder argued that fundamental differences in human intentions and actions can be accounted for in terms of cultural differences, which vary greatly over the world. People in different cultures build different conceptions of the world, including different moral realities. (Rest et al., 1999, p. 168)

According to Shweder et al. (1990), American people reflect "rights-based morality," whereas Indian people reflect "duty-based morality." In America, the postconventional thinking is based on the natural "right" to free contract, personal choice, and individual liberty. The postconventional thinking in India, on the other

hand, is based on the natural “duty” to respect the truths of Hindu dharma—“one must do one’s duty to fulfill one’s role, because sin is always punished in this life or the next; the natural and supernatural world guarantees that everyone gets what they deserve” (Rest et al., 1999, p. 171-172). Then, in a duty-based culture, “the social order dictates specified duties based on roles and status within the social structure” (Turiel, 1998, p. 892). The individual and her/his interior states, preferences, and intentions are not given much importance. Moreover, s/he is not allowed to deviate from rules. “There is no conception of a natural right, such as free speech, that might lead to advocating deviation from the socially defined right” (Turiel, 1998, p. 892).

Miller (1994), based on her studies of American and Hindu Indian populations, supports the claim that an individually oriented interpersonal moral understanding develops among Americans, whereas a duty-based interpersonal moral understanding develops among Hindu Indians. Miller summarizes her research results as follows: in America the highest priority is accorded to individual rights. Therefore, individuals have a minimalist view of interpersonal moral obligations. The individual is expected to detach herself/himself from others and be independent of the social order. For this reason, individuals “are oriented to self-sufficiency, self-reliance, independence, and resistance to social pressure for conformity or obedience to authority” (Turiel, 1998, p. 892). The focus is on the individual’s right to self-determination and to self-actualization. Individuals are expected to orient toward meeting their own needs and pursuing their own satisfaction, success, and happiness. Even though American people view “it as legitimate to have socially enforceable moral rules around issues that

directly further the rights and interests of the individual, such as matters of justice, they are reticent to subject to social regulation matters that do not directly promote individual rights and interests, such as interpersonal responsibilities” (Miller, 1994, p. 18). Thus, it can be said that American moral perspective focuses on a contractual conception of interpersonal commitments. American people regard relationships as voluntary associations intended to serve reciprocal need fulfillment. Bound by choice and not by duty, individuals are viewed as having considerable discretion about whether or not to respond to others’ needs (Miller).

In contrast, Hindu Indians regard interpersonal responsibilities as obligatory rather than as voluntary. In an individually oriented framework, the contract is seen as the prototypical form of social relationship. However, in a duty-based framework, familial relationships are treated as prototypical (Miller, 1994). Therefore, the group as an interconnected network of relationships is central and shared goals are primary. People “are oriented to tradition, duty, obedience to authority, interdependence, and social harmony. Hierarchy, status, and role distinctions predominate” (Turiel, 1998, p. 892). Even though in a duty-based interpersonal moral understanding personal happiness and satisfaction are not goals, the system is not seen as oppressing the individual or as requiring that personal desires be subordinated to the requirements of the social order. Instead, people see themselves as realizing their own essential natures and as obtaining spiritual merit by meeting social role expectations. The duty-based interpersonal morality reflects a contextualized style of moral reasoning. Therefore, in a duty-based framework “there is a tendency to locate moral responsibility for behavior

relationally by reference to processes occurring between persons and the surround, rather than to focus on the autonomous individual as the locus of responsibility” (Miller, 1994, p. 20-21).

In sum, Miller’s (1994) research results show Indians assume a general obligation to respond to the needs of others, while American people see this obligation as dependent on the nature of the relationship and degree of the need. Indians regard interpersonal responsibilities as subject to social enforcement. Americans, on the other hand, see interpersonal responsibilities as matters for personal decision-making. Indians give greater priority to interpersonal responsibilities relative to justice obligations in comparison with Americans. In contrast, Americans give precedence to the justice obligations and portray this choice in moral terms. In general, Indians are more prone to support the interpersonal over the justice alternatives and to categorize this endorsed alternative as a socially enforceable moral duty.

According to Shweder et al. (1990) and Miller (1994), it is likely that collectivistic (or non-Western) cultures other than India also reflect duty-based views of interpersonal responsibilities, while individualistic (or Western) societies other than America reflect individually oriented views. In fact, research shows the duty-based moral understanding found among Hindu Indians may also be present in other collectivistic cultures. For instance, Hong Kong and Mainland Chinese, Tibetan Buddhist monks, Nigerian and Pakistani Muslims, and rural populations in British Honduras, Kenya, and Papua New Guinea have been observed to place greater emphasis on helpfulness and on obligations to relatives. Therefore, contrary to

Kohlberg's ideas, an individually oriented interpersonal moral code may exist in relatively few societies outside of North America and parts of Western Europe, and "dharma" may be an alternative form of postconventional reasoning (Rest et al., 1999).

Gilligan's Theory Of Feminine Morality

Gilligan, who became popular with the feminist revolution during 1970s, affected the discussions in moral theory, psychology, feminism, and other related fields with her ideas (Shweder & Haidt, 1994). Her objective was to give information about women's development which she felt was omitted by traditional developmental theories and, thus, expand the point of view of developmental psychology about human development (Hekman, 1995). For this reason, she sees her work mainly as a contribution to psychology, not to moral philosophy (Siegel, 1986). On the one hand, her ideas and her studies were seen as a messenger of a new moral theory and as a voice against the masculine tradition. On the other hand, however, her methods were criticized, and she was found to be theoretically confused and even anti-feminist (Hekman).

Gilligan's Research Technique

As mentioned before, Kohlberg's studies showed men were more morally advanced with respect to women (Gilligan, 1995). After Kohlberg's observation of women being morally less advanced compared to men, Gilligan (1982) focused her studies on women's development in order to be able to find the reason for difference between men's and women's moral reasoning. By doing interviews with women, she tried to find what created moral conflict for them in their lives and what types of

decision-making strategies they used in resolving these conflicts. According to Gilligan, women's daily lives are built on close interactions with people and, thus, they are interested in resolving moral conflicts experienced in actual contexts. For this reason, she focused her interviews on real-life dilemmas that include real experiences, not on hypothetical dilemmas that deal with the problems in imaginary relations and situations.

Gilligan, as a result of her interviews saw that women, "when describing their own experiences of moral conflict and choice, defined and resolved moral problems in ways that differed from those described in the existing theories of moral development, and in the measures traditionally used for its assessment" (Brown, Tappan, & Gilligan, 1995, p. 312).

Gilligan's Three Levels of Moral Reasoning

In order to study the development of women's moral reasoning, Gilligan (1982) interviewed a group of 29 female subjects, aged 15 and 33 years, facing a substantial real-life moral dilemma: whether or not to have an abortion. She stated this issue posed a central conflict for women and this conflict springs from the tension between the maintenance of self and the maintenance of relationships (Tronto, 1995). In fact, the women participating in this research could not decide whose decisions and choices should be taken into consideration about continuing the pregnancy: theirs or those of the others close to them. Therefore, according to Gilligan, this study showed women experienced the conflict of whether they were supposed to be responsive primarily to their own needs or to the needs of others in their moral decisions.

Gilligan observed women solved this conflict by correctly balancing concerns for the self with concerns for others (Tronto, 1995). However, the success of this depended on the woman's ability to demonstrate mature reasoning (Gilligan, 1982). On the basis of subjects' responses, Gilligan found the way to mature reasoning was through a three-level progression. In other words, she identified three levels of reasoning: from an egocentric through a societal to a universal perspective.

In the first level, the woman's responsibility focuses on the self and self-serving relationships in order to ensure individual survival. The self's needs, not the other's, are given priority in decisions. Therefore, there is inequality between self and other in this level. When the satisfaction of one's own needs is seen to be selfish and the responsibility is oriented to the needs of others, the individual leaves the first level and enters the following transitional phase that provides the path to the second level (Winkler, 1994).

In the second level, it is important for women to conform to society's image of "good woman." "Goodness is seen as self-sacrificial caring for others in order to gain their acceptance" (Walker, 1994, p. 329). For this reason, there is also inequality between self and other in this level. But this time the individual is responsive to others' needs instead of the self's. When the individual realizes she is responsible to herself as much as to others, she leaves the second level and enters the following transitional phase providing the path to the third level (Walker).

In the third level, she is free from conventional constraints. She realizes caring for others is not possible without caring for self. Therefore, in this level, she "strives to

encompass the needs of both self and others, to be responsible to others and thus to be good but also to be responsible to herself and thus to be honest and real” (Gilligan, 1982, p. 85). In other words, she tries not only to consider the needs of others, but also to do the best and the right for herself. Thus, she is also more honest and realistic to her own self. Consequently, she can have open, and honest relationships with others that depend on real feelings and thoughts. She is aware of her own self-worth. And as she acknowledges her own self, she starts making her own choices and being responsible for them. It can be said that while “goodness” is important for women in the second level, the “truth” is important in the third level. In this level, care is seen as a self-chosen, universal obligation that condemns exploitation and violence, and requires one to respond (Lapsley, 1996).

As can be understood from the information above, in each level, women interviewed conceptualized responsibility in different ways (Winkler, 1994). There is increasing differentiation between self and other as the higher levels are reached (Gilligan, 1982). Progress in these stages “is motivated, in part, by the individual’s increasing understanding of human relationships and, in part, by the attempt to maintain one’s own integrity and care for one’s self without neglecting others” (Meyers & Kittay, 1987, p. 8).

Gilligan’s Summary of Her Research Results

Gilligan summarizes her research findings as follows: women’s sense of self is built on interdependence. They see their selves as relational. The relational self is defined “as having both a need for recognition and a need to understand the other”

(Held, 1993, p. 60) and these needs are viewed as compatible. They are created during the mother-child interaction and are satisfied in a mutually empathetic relationship. This kind of relationship does not cause a loss of self. Rather, in this relationship, self and other both respect each other's subjectivity. In other words, "both give and take in a way that not only contributes to the satisfaction of their needs as individuals but also affirms the larger relational unit they compose. Maintaining this larger relational unit then becomes a goal" (Held, 1993, p. 60). Consequently, maturity is defined not as individual autonomy but as competence in creating and maintaining relations of empathy and mutual intersubjectivity (Held). Therefore, for women, the priority is to be in connection with others instead of developing independence. Their reasoning is contextual and embedded in relations with others. They do not isolate themselves from others while they approach situations, instead, they look at situations from this interdependent or relational perspective. Thus, in their thought process, subjectivity instead of objectivity is dominant (Gilligan, 1982).

For women, the loss of relationship means the loss of self. For this reason, they give great importance to not causing conflicts with others, and if there is a conflict, they give great importance to repair the relations. When there is a problem, they listen to each other and try to understand each other's feelings, thoughts, and particular situation (Gilligan, 1988). This is important for finding a specific solution to a specific problem (Gilligan, 1982).

Women's moral concerns focus on care, response to others' needs, and enhance another's well-being, instead of protecting individual rights and evoking strict equality.

They try to solve problems without hurting or leaving anyone alone, considering everyone's happiness and needs. Consequently, as a guide, they use care reasoning that includes emotions such as empathy, sympathy, love, and compassion, instead of justice reasoning that involves logic in the solutions of moral problems (Gilligan, 1982).

Gilligan's Claim of Two Different Moral Domains

“The interpretation of observed differences in moral reasoning-particularly gender differences-has historically been constrained by the assumption that there is a single moral perspective; i.e., male-defined justice perspective” (Brown et al., 1995, p. 313). However, Gilligan (1982), during her research on abortion-decision, observed that rather than seeking solutions to moral conflicts by applying abstract rules of justice to particular situations, most women interviewed were worried about preserving actual human relationships and caring for those for whom they felt responsible. In other words, she observed women give importance to different things in relationships and focus on different issues during moral conflicts than do men. These observations led Gilligan to conclude women's moral thinking emerges not as deficient but as a different voice.

According to Gilligan (1982), women's moral concerns are different from men's, and they approach moral problems from a different perspective as compared to men. Therefore, Gilligan claims there are two different moral domains: the domain of care and responsibility and the domain of justice and rights. Women develop the ethic of care, and they look at moral issues from this perspective, while men develop the ethic of justice.

However, many researchers criticized Gilligan's methodology and considered her evidence as faulty. Walker (1994) stated Gilligan's data were derived from females only, and found, as a result of his research, that gender differences in moral development were not statistically significant. "These criticisms, as well as Gilligan's own research led her to reformulate her position in terms of the focus phenomenon" (Hekman, 1995, p. 18).

Focus Phenomenon

Gilligan and Attanucci (1988) did a study on individual's personal experience of moral conflict and choice and included not only female subjects but also male. During their research, they asked participants to think about real-life moral dilemmas they had experienced and then to rate the extent to which they concentrated on justice or care concerns. As a result of their study, they observed 65% of the participating males revealed a justice focus, 32% showed a mixture of care and justice, and only one showed a care focus. In contrast, 35% of the participating females showed a care focus, 35% showed a mixture of care and justice, and 29% showed a justice focus. These findings led the researchers to conclude that "men and women appeal to both care and justice in their moral deliberations but that men gravitate toward the justice orientation and women gravitate toward the care orientation" (Lapsley, 1996, p. 141). In other words, even though individuals are capable of using both perspectives, women use care reasoning more than men over time, whereas men use justice reasoning more than women (Lapsley). Gilligan and Attanucci have called this finding the "focus phenomenon."

According to Brown et al. (1995), these two perspectives can be seen as the relational voices or moral orientations of justice and care. Gilligan (1995) suggests these two perspectives do not negate one another, but represent two distinct ways of perceiving and responding to problems, conflicts, and dilemmas in relationships.

Johnston (1988) found results supporting Gilligan's ideas. She provided fables including moral conflicts to 60 boys and girls between the age of 11 and 15 years. She asked the participants to state and resolve the conflict posed by the stories, and then she asked if there was another way to resolve this conflict. As a result of her research, she saw girls more often spontaneously used and preferred care solutions, while boys more often spontaneously used and preferred justice solutions to the stories she posed. However, she also observed boys and girls could shift their perspectives and look at the situations from the viewpoint of both perspectives when invited to do so. According to Brown et al. (1995), these findings show human beings not only have multiple voices, "but they can and frequently do oscillate from one voice to another in their moral discourse" (Brown et al., 1995, p. 324).

The Link Between Selfhood and Morality

Gilligan (1988) claimed which perspective individuals mainly use in their lives changed according to what type of self they developed. According to Gilligan, man attains his self by detaching himself from others (separate self), and this forms a basis for the justice perspective. On the other hand, woman attains her self by staying attached to others (relational self), and this forms a basis for the care perspective. In fact, Lyons's (1988) research showed separate individuals tend to use a morality of

justice, while relational individuals tend to use a morality of care. For this reason, Gilligan believes morality and selfhood are intimately linked. In other words, modes of self-definition affect modes of moral judgment. According to Hekman (1995), this viewpoint is one of Gilligan's greatest contributions in the field of moral theory.

The Origins of the Orientations of Justice and Care

Brown et al. (1995) locate the development of the two selves (separate self/relational self), and, thus, the justice and care orientations, in two dimensions of early childhood relationships. One dimension is that of equality/inequality, and the other dimension is that of attachment/detachment.

Young children who see their relationships with others from an equality/inequality perspective feel smaller, less capable, and less powerful than older children and adults. But with development, they progress to equality and independence and, thus, overcome these unequal relationships (Walker, 1995). According to Brown et al. (1995), this dimension of relationship has been stressed by both cognitive and psychoanalytic theorists who studied moral development. Focusing on the constraint of the young child's situation, these theorists defined morality as justice and saw development as the child's progression toward equality and independence (Gilligan & Attanucci, 1988).

However, according to Gilligan (1988), children also experience attachment, and these attachment relationships create a different awareness of self with respect to the awareness of self created by experiences of inequality. Through attachment relationships, children "discover the patterns of human interaction and observe the

ways in which people care for and hurt one another. The experience of attachment profoundly affects children's understanding of human feelings and how people should act toward one another" (Gilligan & Wiggins, 1988, p. 114-115). Therefore, children who see their relationships with others from an attachment/detachment perspective are sensitive to considering others' well-being and the need to maintain connections with others (Gilligan).

The Development of Different Moral Orientations of Two Genders

According to Gilligan (1988), both equality/inequality and attachment/detachment relationships are experienced by boys and girls. Consequently, these experiences sensitize children to two different moral standards: the standard of justice (do not treat others unfairly) and the standard of care (help others). As both women and men have these two moral standards in their backgrounds, these two moral perspectives interact in many cases in men's and women's lives, and they cause confusion, tension, and ambiguity in resolving real-life dilemmas. As a result, women and men experience the conflict of which perspective they should use to solve moral problems, when the demands of justice and the demands of care clash (Lapsley, 1996).

However, even though individuals are capable of looking at things in two different ways, and even though they feel conflict in which perspective they should use, they believe there is one "better or right way" of seeing, and this "right way" makes the other way disappear. According to Brown et al. (1995), different upbringings engender different moral orientations. Gender-role socialization emphasizes the experience of attachment/detachment and, thus, relational self development for girls, whereas it

emphasizes the experience of equality/inequality and, thus, separate self development for boys. This situation makes a different orientation “right or better” for two different sexes (Lapsley, 1996).

Following birth, both boys and girls interact primarily with their mothers in the first years as their fathers are normally at work. However, early mother-daughter relationships contrast with early mother-son relationships (Chodorow, 1978). Mothers “experience their daughters as more like, and continuous with, themselves” (Gilligan, 1982, p. 7) because they are from the same sex and push their daughters toward connection and dependency (Attanucci, 1988). As girls are not encouraged to be separate from their mothers, they become attached to their mothers and identify with them (Hekman, 1995). Consequently, in girls, the experience of inequality becomes less salient, whereas the experience of attachment, of connecting with others, is more central to their self-definition. Therefore, they give importance to the nature or the strength of connection more than the consequences of unequal relationships (Gilligan & Wiggins, 1988). In terms of self-esteem, it is seen as being more crucial to make and maintain relationships with others. Consequently, care becomes more salient with respect to justice in their moral experiences (Gilligan).

In contrast, mothers experience their sons as a male opposite (Gilligan, 1982) and push them toward independence (Attanucci, 1988). For this reason, boys separate themselves from their mothers and tend towards identifying with their fathers. Because boys identify with their fathers, the physical power and the authority of their fathers become their focus. Therefore, for boys, the experience of inequality is more salient,

and the desire to overcome this unequal relationship becomes more important in self-concept organization. For this reason, boys can be insensitive to problems springing from detachment, and independence becomes more crucial for self-esteem. Consequently, justice becomes more salient in their moral experiences with respect to care (Gilligan & Wiggins, 1988).

The Signs of Justice and Care Perspectives in Boys and Girls During Middle Childhood

Lever (as cited in Gilligan, 1982) examined if there are gender differences in the games children play. Her study included 181 fifth-grade, white, 10 and 11-year-old children from middle-class families. Similar to early childhood, she observed boys are sensitive to the concepts of equality, separation, and justice, whereas girls are sensitive to connection, relations, and compassion in middle-childhood. Her research results can be summarized as follows: boys play more competitive games and continuously quarrel during the play. However, they pay attention to rights, rules, and legal debates in the game and, thus, they can effectively resolve disputes. Girls, on the other hand, prefer play in which competition is indirect and, therefore, they fall into less disputes which require adjudication in their play. They are more tolerant to rules and more willing to make exceptions. When there is a quarrel, they tend to end the play instead of resolving the disputes in order not to break the relationships.

As pointed out by Gilligan (1982), Lever's study shows boys are more concerned with rules during play. Within the limits of the rules, boys learn independence, competing with friends, playing with the enemy, and "the organizational

skills necessary for coordinating the activities of large and diverse groups of people” (Gilligan, 1982, p. 10). Therefore, in boys, play fosters the development of taking the role of the generalized other and learning the abstraction of human relationships. Girls, on the other hand, are more concerned with relationships during play. They learn to be cooperative, as opposed to being competitive, in play. For this reason, in girls, play fosters “the development of the empathy and sensitivity necessary for taking the role of the particular other and points more toward knowing the other as different from the self” (Gilligan, 1982, p. 10).

These observations indicate boys and girls reach puberty with different interpersonal orientations and social experiences. Boys grow up giving priority to separation and individuation, whereas girls grow up giving priority to connection and relationships. However, according to Gilligan (1982), separation, not connection, is seen as being crucial in the development of identity in adolescence; therefore, adult development of boys is viewed as more healthy in that they separate, whereas adult developmental progression of girls, as they cannot successfully separate, is seen as less healthy.

The Psychological Development of Girls and the Emergence of the Care Perspective

Brown and Gilligan (1992) believe the adolescent period is a crisis for girls. However, according to these researchers, the reason for this crisis is not because girls fail to separate. Brown and Gilligan did research on the psychological development of preadolescent and adolescent girls and concluded the following.

Contemporary moral development theories (including Kohlberg's) view development as a progression from dependence to independence, from reliance on relationships to autonomous selfhood (Hekman, 1995). However, adolescent girls perceive dependence to be positive rather than negative, and they resist detaching from their relationships and prefer to stay attached. It is a mistake to see girls as a failure in adult development just because they resist detachment. Girls do not develop the autonomous self, not because they cannot succeed in being independent, but because they do not prefer to do so. Psychological health for girls can be defined as staying in relationships as opposed to disengaging from them. Real psychological crises in women's lives spring from disconnection (Brown & Gilligan, 1992).

Girls, in preadolescence, seem to be outspoken and self-confident, and they want honest dialogues. Preadolescent girls believe honest dialogues can be full of genuine disagreements, but they know these disagreements will not jeopardize relationships. They are not afraid of engaging in conflicts with others, and they are able to make their own decisions. Adolescent girls, on the other hand, seem to be affected by social norms, values, and roles. In other words, priority for adolescent girls is conformity to society's expectations and engaging in conventional female behavior. Conventional female behavior necessitates not hurting others, not engaging in open conflicts and disagreements in relationships, and, thus, withholding real feelings and thoughts. Consequently, adolescent girls give priority to meeting others' needs in making their decisions. Otherwise, they can be perceived as rude, mean, and selfish. For this reason, they abandon real relationships in which genuine feelings and thoughts

are shared and get involved in idealized relationships. However, in contrast with how this is generally perceived, this situation actually constitutes disconnection instead of connection (Brown & Gilligan, 1992).

To summarize, for preadolescent girls, it is more important to have authentic and honest relationships than to maintain any relationship, whereas for adolescent girls, it is more important to maintain relationships and prevent isolation and violation than it is to have open and mutual relationships. Prior to adolescence, there is no great differentiation between the justice and care perspectives as preadolescent girls are also concerned with obeying the rules and, therefore, they also exhibit the justice perspective. Then, for girls, the care perspective gains importance especially in adolescence (Brown et al., 1995).

Society considers moral problems not from a viewpoint of the concerns and values expressed by the adolescent girls, but from a viewpoint of abstract and universal principles. Therefore, according to Gilligan (1988), as thinking takes a conventional form during adolescence, girls are affected by the dominant moral voice of the society—justice. For this reason, in this period, justice reasoning, which is explicit in traditional moral development theories, takes importance in girls' moral judgments. In other words, adolescent girls base their moral decisions on justice instead of care, even though their moral voices are rooted in emotion, particularity, and connectedness. Johnston (1988) found results supporting Gilligan's ideas. She observed 15-year-old girls look at moral problems primarily from the justice perspective.

Brown and Gilligan's (1992) study demonstrates preadolescent girls can maintain their selves in their relationships. However, when they move into adolescence, they leave this "self" and turn inward in order to display the image of "good woman." In other words, they are pushed by society to become selfless and move toward self-sacrifice. Also, their care voice is suppressed by the justice voice, which is dominant in society. Therefore, according to Brown and Gilligan, for girls, adolescence constitutes a crisis or regression, not progression.

Differences During Adulthood

During early childhood, middle childhood and adolescence, girls mature with values different from boys. This difference in values continues during adulthood and shapes the priorities of the individual. In fact, Horner (as cited in Gilligan, 1982) found women avoid competitive achievement and success because they think these can cause social rejection, isolation, and loss of femininity. Men, on the other hand, avoid intimacy and close personal affiliations because they think these can violate their rights and limit personal success.

Gilligan's Thoughts on the Coexistence of Justice and Care

According to Gilligan (1995), the justice and care perspectives are independent from but complement each other. They constitute a harmonious whole together (Hekman, 1995). What is important is not to see which perspective is superior or better (Brown et al., 1995). "Rather, the issue concerns how the two moral perspectives interact in situations of moral choice and the gender-typed pattern of preference exhibited by men and women" (Lapsley, 1996, p. 140).

Gilligan points out that mature reasoning about care should incorporate considerations of justice and rights (Koehn, 1998). However, she believes an impartial concern for others' rights is not sufficient to provide for care (Lyons, 1988) and trying to ensure equality among people or protect individual rights is not sufficient for respecting people's rights. According to Gilligan (1995), the care perspective "draws attention to the fact that one's own terms may differ from those of others. Justice in this context becomes understood as respect for people in their own terms" (p. 36-37). Therefore, according to Gilligan, the best way to respect people's rights is to consider their particular thoughts and feelings in solving moral conflicts.

Gilligan (1988) states participants who spontaneously use the justice reasoning often agree the solution suggested by exponents of the care reasoning is a better solution. In fact, she observed a group of boys using justice strategies would actually prefer using care solutions if they did not find care as being "naive" and "unworkable." According to Gilligan, as long as morality is equated with justice and care is equated with self-sacrifice, women are likely to appear problematic within moral theory and individuals will tend to be distant from the care perspective. Gilligan (1995) argues care includes a mutual relationship, not self-sacrifice. In other words, care is both self-serving and other-serving. Care relationships are expected to grow with respect to reciprocity. Therefore, ethical caring should not be confused with unconditional love. In ethical caring, "the self is sufficiently distinct from the relation as to be entitled to specify some conditions which her voluntary relations should meet. In the event these conditions are not met, she is entitled to break off these relations" (Koehn, 1998, p. 46).

According to Gilligan (1982), there are sex differences in morality, and this fact cannot be denied. Moral developmental theories should include the experiences of women as well as the experiences of men and, thus, include the moral voices of both sexes. Many feminist writers agree with Gilligan's ideas. According to Baier (1995), "the best moral theory has to be a cooperative product of women and men, has to harmonize justice and care. The morality it theorizes about is after all for all persons, for men and for women, and will need their combined insights" (p. 57).

Research Findings on Gilligan's Fundamental Theses

Differences in Moral Orientation

As mentioned before, Gilligan (1982) claims two different moral domains: the domain of care and responsibility and the domain of justice and rights. Most people focus on one orientation and minimally represent the other. Individuals are consistent in the use of a single orientation. Men predominantly use the justice perspective, while women predominantly use the care perspective (Brown et al., 1995).

Research Findings in the U.S.

Research shows care reasoning can be identified in people's responses to both real-life and hypothetical dilemmas. The majority of people, regardless of their gender, use both the justice and care orientations. Therefore, both males and females have been found to be sensitive to the potential pain others might suffer and they have been found to consider human relationships important moral considerations. However, the studies examining the hypothesis that moral orientation is gender-related result in inconsistent findings. While some studies indicate women show a preference for the care orientation

and men for justice in self-identified moral dilemmas, some studies do not show a significant difference between men's and women's moral orientations (Bebeau & Brabeck, 1994).

In 1986 Ford and Lowery did research with a sample of 202 college students (101 male and 101 female undergraduates) between 18 and 29 years of age. The participants completed a self-report questionnaire on moral dilemmas they had experienced. Then, they rated their use of both justice and care perspectives in solving those dilemmas. The results showed sex differences in moral orientation were very small and statistically nonsignificant. Both sexes have been observed to consider issues of relationship, care, and responsibility, as well as issues of fairness, justice, and rights. However, female participants were more consistent in their use of care reasoning, whereas male participants were more consistent in their use of justice reasoning. Jadack, Hyde, Moore, and Keller (1995) provided hypothetical dilemmas to college freshmen and seniors and asked them to explain why they believed the characters should or should not engage in risky behaviors. There were no gender differences in moral orientation.

Garmon, Basinger, Gregg, and Gibbs (1996) conducted a study on 543 participants, aged 9 to 81 years, including delinquents. The researchers observed care reasoning was prevalent in females' moral judgment. In 1996, Lollis, Ross, and Leroux observed 40 families with two children, aged 2 and 4 years. They investigated gender differences in the parents' moral orientation, and gender differences in the socialization of moral orientation of the children. The researchers observed gender-related

orientations in parents. Regardless of the gender of the children, fathers used slightly more justice than care orientation, while mothers used significantly more care than justice. However, children were not being socialized differently according to their sex. In 1997 Cassidy, Chu, and Dahlsgaard investigated the moral reasoning preschoolers use in solving moral problems. They provided moral dilemmas to 31 preschool children and asked them to state and resolve the problem posed by the dilemmas. Results showed justice and care solutions were equally frequent in children's answers. There were no gender differences in moral orientation.

As pointed out by Colby and Damon (1994), studies on moral orientation yield little support for the view that there is a generalized distinction between men and women in their orientations. Most researchers believe the choice of moral orientation is linked to the type of dilemma discussed, not to gender. In fact, Walker et al. (1987) in their research on 80 Canadian family triads (e.g., mother, father, and child) found that not the dilemma format (hypothetical or real-life) but the content of the dilemma was an important influence on orientation use. Personal/relational dilemmas tended to be discussed in terms of care and response, whereas impersonal/nonrelational dilemmas tended to be reasoned in terms of justice and rights (regardless of the participant's sex).

Research Findings in Other Cultures

Other cultures also tested Gilligan's claim of separate moral domains. As mentioned above, Walker et al. (1987) interviewed 80 Canadian families. Female participants reported more personal-relationship conflicts, whereas male participants

reported more impersonal-relationship conflicts. Therefore, gender differences were evident in dilemma content. However, when dilemma content was controlled, sex differences disappeared in orientations.

Stander and Jensen (1993) administered the World View Questionnaire to 60 Chinese and 61 American university students. As a result of their research they observed a significantly higher total number of caring adjectives chosen by female participants than by male participants. Therefore, females were found to be more oriented towards using care reasoning. However, contrary to expectations, the Chinese chose much fewer caring adjectives with respect to Americans.

In 1996 Lyons interviewed 27 (14 female, 13 male) undergraduate students attending the Middle East Technical University in Turkey. Turkish male students showed a tendency to be more oriented towards separation and objectiveness. And the majority of male students used justice reasoning in resolving moral dilemmas. In contrast, Turkish female students showed a tendency to be more oriented towards being connected and contextual, and most of the female students used care reasoning in resolving moral dilemmas. However, there were no significant gender differences...

in the topic of moral conflict chosen, the use of a response or rights orientation in resolving moral dilemmas, self-description, or perceptions of dependence and independence. In other words, the data demonstrated stronger convergence between the genders than divergence. Also, there was a close connection between students' self description as connected and their use of response orientation

in resolving their real life moral dilemma. And there was a close connection between the students' self description as separate or objective and the use of rights orientation in resolving their real life moral dilemma. (Lyons, 1996, p. 111)

Differences in Moral Reasoning

Analyses of Kohlberg's stages of moral development by Gilligan concluded that females generally do not pass the middle stage of moral development. Thus, instead of reaching stage 4, law and order, as many males do, women only reach stage 3 where the conception of justice is integrated with a conception of a good interpersonal relationship. (Lyons, 1996, p. 44)

As mentioned before, Gilligan (1982) asserts the very basis of Kohlberg's framework—the focus on the development of justice reasoning—reflects a male way of looking at things as Kohlberg developed his stages on the basis of male subjects' reasoning only. She believes this constitutes a bias against females in the instrumentation and scoring procedures. According to Gilligan, women score lower than men on Kohlberg's moral reasoning test as women prefer the lower stages (particularly Stage 3) or care-based stages. Kohlberg, on the other hand, sees stage 3 as functional for housewives and mothers (Gilligan & Wiggins, 1988). He believes women's development would morally mature “when they are challenged to solve moral problems that require them to see beyond the relationships that have in the past generally bound their moral experience” (Lyons, 1996, p. 45). Therefore, according to

Kohlberg, if women, like men, were to obtain higher status jobs and more education, they too would rise to the postconventional level (Hekman, 1995) as higher education and job experience provide perspective-taking opportunities for women and introduce them to social issues that extend beyond interpersonal relationships to entire political and social affiliations (Gilligan & Wiggins).

Research Findings in the U.S.

Walker (1994) reviewed a total of 54 North American studies that compared the development of moral judgment between the genders using the MJII and found the following results: the sex differences in moral reasoning were rare in childhood and early adolescence. When they occurred, most studies in which sex differences were obtained indicated more mature development for females. However, these differences were small. Sex differences were rare in late adolescence and youth, as was the case earlier in development. And when they occurred, most studies in which sex differences were obtained indicated more mature development for males. However, these differences were small. Only a minority of studies indicated sex differences in moral reasoning in adulthood, and even in those studies the differences tended to be small. When education and/or occupation were controlled, sex differences in moral reasoning disappeared.

In 1984 Thoma (as cited in Gielen, 1996) conducted a meta-analysis on DIT data including 56 samples. His review showed overall and at every age/education level females received significantly higher scores than males. However, the magnitude of difference was small.

Studies conducted in the 1990s also indicated more mature development for females. Eisenberg, Carlo, Murphy, and Van Court (1995) did longitudinal research with 17- to 18- and 19- to 20-year olds. Their results showed females' overall reasoning was higher than males'. Beller and Stoll (1995) examined cognitive moral reasoning of high school student athletes and their nonathlete peers. Females scored significantly higher than males.

Research Findings in Other Cultures

Snarey (1985), in his review of cross-cultural studies on Kohlberg's stages, observed that only 3 of the 17 studies reported gender differences. English male students (ages 11 to 14) were observed to be more advanced than their female peers in moral reasoning. The German study did not show any significant overall difference; however, female university students were found to be more likely than male students to exhibit Stage 3 reasoning (other studies conducted with university students – Finland, Hong Kong, Indonesia, Japan, Kenya, Taiwan – did not find significant gender differences). In India, two studies did not find any sex differences and one did. However, the latter study used a less reliable scoring system than the other two studies. Therefore, according to Snarey, the evidence against gender differences in moral reasoning in India is stronger.

Even though Moon (1986) in his review of cross-cultural studies on the DIT observed significant gender differences in many studies, the magnitude of the differences was small. Moon observed that most of the Chinese and Korean studies show sex differences in P-scores and Stage 4 scores. In these studies female students

received higher P-scores but lower Stage 4 scores than did males. English female high school students received higher Stage 3 scores than their male counterparts. There were no significant sex differences in P-scores in the American and Australian samples.

As a result of their review of cross-cultural studies on the DIT, Gielen and Markoulis (1994) reported no significant sex differences in P-scores in the Belize (sample: adolescents – ages 12 to 19), Trinidad-Tobago (sample: adolescents and college students), Kuwait (sample: high school, college, and university students), Sudan (sample: high school, college, and university students), Greece (sample: adolescents and adults – ages 13 to 23), and Poland (sample: high school and college students) studies. In the Hong Kong (sample: junior high school, senior high school, and college students), South Korea (sample: junior high school, senior high school, and college students), and Taiwan (sample: junior high school, senior high school, and college students) studies, however, females received significantly higher P-scores than did males. The magnitude of the differences was small.

Cesur (1997) and Tolunay (2001) administered the DIT to Turkish university students and observed that females' overall reasoning was higher than males'.

Criticisms On Gilligan

Miller's Claim-the Ethic of Care Reflects Western Values

According to Miller (1994), Gilligan's theory does not have sufficient sensitivity to the role of enculturation processes in development. She argues the connected view of self and the associated ethic of care "may be reflective of certain modern Western cultural assumptions and inadequate as characterizations of

conceptions emphasized in groups that maintain alternative cultural viewpoints” (Miller, 1994, p. 10). Whereas Gilligan’s theory emphasizes the importance of deep universals of experience such as the nature of mother/child attachment, it overlooks the effect of cultural factors that may qualitatively influence the nature of these experiences, for instance, conceptions of the child or of attachment. Experiences of attachment and of inequality common across all cultures are presumed to be the most important environmental influences on development. “In turn, cultural belief systems are viewed as having no impact on development, apart from their relationship to gender” (Miller, 1994, p. 10). According to Miller, this failure to see culture as an independent effect on development confines both the generality and explanatory adequacy of Gilligan’s model. The ethic of care seems ill equipped to define the distribution of morality cross-culturally.

Extending the logic of Gilligan’s argument to diverse cultural groups, it would be expected that concepts of self and morality would be more similar among individuals of the same gender from different cultures than among individuals of different genders from the same culture. Such a claim, however, appears contradicted by the extensive anthropological and psychological evidence documenting marked culturally based differences in the views of self held among individuals from the United States as contrasted with from various non-Western cultures. If Gilligan’s theory is treated as applicable only to American populations it

appears incomplete in that it fails to consider the ways in which gender-related experiences may be affected by the larger cultural context in which they occur. It cannot be assumed that whereas American males' views of self and morality are both shaped and supported by the individualism of the larger culture, American females' views of self and morality develop autonomously and only stand opposed to the values of the dominant culture. Just as the morality of justice developed among Americans reflects the individualism of the larger culture, it would be expected that the morality of caring developed among Americans also reflects aspects of this individualism. (Miller, 1994, p. 11)

Turiel's View on Childhood Relationships

Like Gilligan, Turiel (1998) also locates the development of justice and care perspectives in two dimensions of early childhood relationships. Gilligan and Wiggins (1988) assert attachment/detachment relationships are central social experiences for girls, whereas equality/inequality relationships are central for boys. However, according to Turiel, equality/inequality relationships are at least as salient for girls as for boys.

Starting within the family, and then in school, and the wider society, girls confront unequal treatment in more poignant ways than boys. Women, too, experience inequalities and unjust treatment in ways that permeate their family and work experiences. Conversely, issues

of attachment and detachment may be salient in the experiences of boys in ways that go beyond learning separation and individuation. For boys, the prominence of groups, cliques, team sports, and gangs are evidence of the pull for cooperation, attachments, and solidarity pervasive in their experiences. (Turiel, 1998, p. 885)

Therefore, according to Turiel (1998), issues of justice, fairness, individuation, care, responsiveness, and interdependence coexist in children's social experiences and developing judgments.

Kohlberg's Claim—Justice Reasoning Includes Care

Kohlberg accepts the presence of a care perspective in people's moral thinking (Brown et al., 1995) "but rejects Gilligan's contention that this phenomenon requires a new approach to moral theory" (Hekman, 1995, p. 28). According to Kohlberg, care is included in justice reasoning (Bebeau & Brabeck, 1994), and both the care and the justice voices are represented in the postconventional level. He claims most of the moral dilemmas do not pose a choice between the orientations, but "almost always call out a response which integrates the two orientations" (Spiecker, 1994, p. 298).

Walker et al. (1987) found results supporting Kohlberg's ideas. Their research results showed individuals, who reason at the highest level in Kohlberg's moral stages, "tend to be split in their moral orientations-to evidence substantial amounts of both response and rights reasoning" (Walker et al., 1987, p. 856-857).

The Comparison of Justice and Care Perspectives

According to the justice perspective, self is attained through separation (Gilligan, 1982) and is seen as individualistic (Koehn, 1998). Therefore, the ethic of justice gives importance to autonomy and its considerations are individuals and preserving of individual rights. According to the care perspective, on the other hand, self is attained through connection (Gilligan) and is seen as relational (Koehn). Therefore, the ethic of care gives importance to interdependence, and its considerations are relationships and promoting the welfare of others (Lyons, 1988).

In the justice perspective, individuals try to avoid hurting others by respecting their rights. Individuals defending the justice perspective recognize their actions can affect others. Therefore, in this perspective, responsibility means to limit the behavior, in other words, avoid aggressive and manipulative behavior which can violate the rights of others. In the care perspective, individuals try to avoid hurting others by being sensitive to their needs. Individuals defending the care perspective recognize they have relationships relying on interdependence and that others count on them. Therefore, in this perspective, responsibility means to meet others' expectations and be responsive to their particular needs (Gilligan, 1982).

“An assumption of the justice perspective is that others are the same as the self” (Lyons, 1988, p. 33). Therefore, the consideration of treating others as you would like to be treated is given priority in this perspective. Consequently, the justice perspective gives importance to reciprocity to be able to provide fairness (Gilligan, 1982). The goal

is to ensure equality among individuals (Baier, 1995). Thus, in this perspective, individuals try to resolve conflicts in ways that would result in justice. Moral maturity is defined as justice reasoning (Koehn, 1998).

“An assumption of the care perspective is that others are different from oneself” (Lyons, 1988, p. 34). Therefore, the consideration of treating people the way they need to be treated is given priority in this perspective. Consequently, the care perspective gives importance to seeing the situation in its context and perceiving people in their own terms to be able to identify and understand their particular needs (Walker, 1995). The goal is to preserve relationships (Gilligan, 1982). Therefore, in this perspective, individuals try to resolve conflicts “in ways that would repair and strengthen webs of relationships” (Jaggar, 1991, p. 82). Moral maturity is defined as being able to make and maintain relationships (Gilligan).

In the justice perspective, to be able to treat everybody the same (Hoffman, 1994) requires being impartial and objective in moral judgments. These necessitate autonomous thinking and, thus, distance in relationships (Koehn, 1998). Therefore, attachment, which is seen as the marker of mature moral judgment in the care perspective, is perceived as the failure to treat others fairly, as equals and constitutes a moral problem in the justice perspective (Gilligan & Attanucci, 1988). In the care perspective, to be able to treat everybody the way each needs to be treated (Lyons, 1988) requires being partial and subjective in moral judgments. This necessitates looking at situations from the interdependent perspective and, thus, intimacy in relationships (Gilligan, 1982). Therefore, detachment, which is seen as the marker of

mature moral judgment in the justice perspective, is perceived as the failure to attend to need and constitutes a moral problem in the care perspective (Gilligan & Attanucci).

According to the justice perspective, all rational beings are alike and they follow the same course of action in resolving moral conflicts (Koehn, 1998). Therefore, individuals use the moral system of abstract rules and universal principles that apply to all situations and societies in resolving their competing claims to justice (Colby & Damon, 1994). They “need not consult with others in the applications of these principles” (Koehn, 1998, p. 21). This perspective “creates links between persons, who are assumed to be fundamentally in conflict regarding their rights” (Colby & Damon, 1994, p. 278-279). Therefore, the ethic of justice is tied to formal and abstract situations and relationships (Tronto, 1994). According to the care perspective, on the other hand, everyone’s life and needs are different and, thus, every conflict may necessitate a different solution. Universal rules are seen as insufficient in finding particular solutions to particular situations. Therefore, in this perspective, individuals do not appeal to the moral system of abstract rules in resolving conflicts. Instead, they try to understand each other’s feelings and thoughts and solve moral conflicts through conversation (Koehn). The care perspective gives importance to others’ concerns and reasoning in solving problems. It is important to create a solution responsive to the needs of all involved (Gilligan, 1988) or find a solution that is the least painful alternative for all involved (Lyons, 1988). Therefore, the ethic of care is tied to concrete and particular circumstances. In other words, this morality is grounded in the daily experiences and moral problems of real people in their everyday lives (Tronto).

The justice perspective perceives moral conflict as conflict of rights (Siegel, 1986). In other words, individuals experience conflict when they are confused about how conflicting rights are to be prioritized or about which acts will be more effective in the protection of individual rights and justice (Gilligan, 1988). The care perspective perceives moral conflict as conflict of responsibilities (Siegel). In other words, individuals experience conflict when they are confused about whose needs should be met first. Particularly, the conflict is experienced when there is confusion on whether the individual's needs or the needs of others should be prioritized (Gilligan, 1982).

An individual defending the justice perspective sees her/his relationships with others from an inequality/equality perspective. Therefore, s/he focuses on the vulnerability of people to oppression. An individual defending the care perspective sees her/his relationships with others from an attachment/detachment or connection/disconnection perspective. Therefore, s/he focuses on the vulnerability of people to isolation and abandonment (Brown, Tappan, Gilligan, Miller, & Argyris, 1994).

An individual defending the justice perspective believes emotions ruin impartiality and prevent people from making decisions which ensure equality. For this reason, in this perspective, reason, not emotion, is taken as a guide in moral judgments (Gilligan, 1982). Therefore, individuals believing in the justice perspective “view moral conflicts as abstract, logical problems concerning rights and rules” (Friedman, Robinson, & Friedman, 1994, p. 285). An individual defending the care perspective believes logical reasoning prevents people from seeing others in their own terms, from

being responsive to others' particular needs, and causes disconnection among people. For this reason, in the care perspective, emotions such as empathy, compassion, and love, not reason, are taken as guides in moral judgments (Gilligan).

Social Structure and Gender Equality in Turkey

After the Republic was founded in Turkey in 1923, radical attempts were undertaken to improve the status of women and, thus, to promote gender equality (Arat, 1994). The founders of the new regime “aimed to establish a liberal Western society, secular as well as democratic, in Turkey” (Arat, 1994, p. 243). Therefore, development and modernization in Turkey were defined as Westernization. In 1926, the Republic of Turkey adopted the Swiss Civil Code as the basis of its Civil Law that included Family Law. As a result, “compared to their counterparts in other developing countries, especially those in the Muslim world, Turkish women have enjoyed considerable civil and political rights and been more visible in the public domain” (Arat, 1994, p. 57). For example, with the new Law Turkish women gained several legal rights, such as the right to choose their own spouses, initiate divorce, and demand child custody. Furthermore, the Civil Law abolished polygamy, prohibited child marriages by bringing a minimum age for marriage, and recognized women as legal equals of men in inheriting and maintaining property (Arat).

In 1930, women gained the right to vote and run in municipal elections, and in 1934, they gained the right to run in national elections. These new rights caused Turkish women to gain access to education and employment opportunities. “In fact, the statistical indicators of female representation among professionals in Turkey has been

more impressive than those in many Western countries” (Arat, 1994, p. 58). In the 1970s, 1 in every 5 lawyers and 1 in every 6 doctors in Turkey was a woman, and “Turkey ranked third, following the United States and Canada, among all countries in the world in recruiting women into academia” (Arat, 1994, p. 58).

However, with the effect of conservative groups and Islamic tradition, these reforms made limited impact on rural areas. Furthermore, as the new “reforms were not aimed at liberating women, instead of promoting the development of female consciousness and feminine identity, they strove to equip Turkish women with the education and finer skills that would improve their contribution to the republican patriarchy as better wives and mothers” (Arat, 1994, p. 59). The aim of these reforms was, then, to transform Turkey into a civilized nation acceptable to the West, not to provide women the opportunity to achieve individual goals. Consequently, in Turkey, the feminist movement has increasingly gained importance since the 1980s. The goal of this movement was to promote women’s respectability as individuals, rather than as mothers, wives, or sisters (Arat).

The women’s movement contributed significantly to the process of democratization in Turkey during the 1980s. “The movement did not merely give more women the opportunity to participate in politics, but also helped create the political milieu conducive to the establishment of a political democracy” (Arat, 1994, p. 241). In 2001, with the help of this movement, the articles that reflect male dominance in marriage were abolished from the Law (e.g., man is the head of the union of marriage;

the right and responsibility of deciding the place of residence belongs to the husband; upon marriage, the wife has to use the husband's family name).

Despite all these new reforms and movements, in today's Turkey, women have limited interest to both education and employment compared to men. In fact, research shows the education level of women in Turkey is much below that of men. Furthermore, even among the educated women, participation in the labor force has been observed to be small. Women working outside the home do so to contribute to the economic needs of the family. However, most of these working women do not have financial independence. Therefore, it can be said that in Turkey women are usually in subordinate and vulnerable positions relative to men (Arat, 1994). However, more and more women in Turkey are becoming financially and individually independent everyday, and during the last decade, the role of the Turkish woman has increased all the way to Prime Minister.

Anthropological and psychological studies characterized "traditional Turkish culture as a group-oriented culture, with tightly knit social networks and little place for personal initiative." Therefore Turkish people can be expected to reflect collectivist values. However, Turkish society is rapidly shifting from a traditional, agrarian culture into a modern, urbanized nation (Phalet & Claeys, 1993).

Studies of modern Turkish culture suggest integration of old collectivist group loyalties with new individualistic achievement. Although traditional group orientation is apparently preserved in high familism and transferred to new national and private

organizations, evidence is found for increased achievement motivation in modern Turkish youth, together with more internal control and future orientation. (Phalet & Claeys, 1993, p. 322)

In fact, Phalet and Claeys (1993) in their study on Turkish and Belgian youth observed that independence, freedom, and responsibility were among the most preferred values in Turkish youth. This finding suggests that “modern Turkish youth opens a perspective on integration of individualistic and collectivist values” (Phalet & Claeys, 1993, p. 322).

Purpose of the Study

As mentioned in the literature review section, Nisan and Kohlberg (1982) examined the moral development of Turkish people between 1964 and 1976 and found evidence for the universality claim of the moral stages in their work. In fact, the researchers observed moral growth through the sequence of stages of moral judgment among Turkish participants. However, Turkish participants showed little evidence of Stage 5 compared to their U.S. counterparts. The first aim of this study is to compare female-US, male-US, female-Turkish, and male-Turkish university student populations in terms of Kohlberg’s stages of moral reasoning to assess the significance of cultural and gender differences, using the DIT as a tool. In Nisan and Kohlberg’s study, the Turkish sample consisted of only male participants. In this research, females were also included.

In 1996 Lyons examined justice and care orientations among Turkish university students and did not find significant differences between males and females in terms of

the moral orientations in resolving moral dilemmas. The second aim of this study is to compare and contrast justice and care orientations among female-US, male-US, female-Turkish, and male-Turkish university student populations to assess the significance of cultural and gender differences, using the MMO as a tool.

This research is thought to contribute to the scientific world in two aspects. First, it is the first cross-cultural statistical comparison between Turkish and U.S. populations using Gilligan's theory. Second, it compares a Western society (U.S.) with a non-Western society (Turkey) in terms of both moral reasoning and moral orientation using both genders (male and female).

Hypotheses

(1) Based on the lack of clear results regarding cultural differences in moral stages in the literature, it is hypothesized that in both the US and Turkish cultures, the moral reasoning of both males and females will reflect Kohlberg's stages 2, 3, 4, 5A, 5B, and 6. Therefore, there will be no significant ($p > .05$) difference based on culture in the stage scores for moral reasoning as measured by the DIT-short form.

(2) Based on the evidence in the literature previously cited that females tend to yield higher P-scores than do males, it is hypothesized that the Stage 5A and 5B mean scores for females will be significantly ($p < .05$) higher than the Stage 5A and 5B mean scores for males as measured by the DIT-short form.

(3) Based on the evidence in the literature previously cited that males tend to yield higher Stage 4 scores than do females, it is hypothesized that the mean score of Stage 4 reasoning for males as measured by the DIT-short form will be significantly

($p < .05$) higher than the mean score of Stage 4 reasoning for females.

(4) Based on the evidence regarding cultural and gender differences in postconventional reasoning cited in the literature, it is hypothesized that there will be a significant ($p < .05$) difference in postconventional reasoning measured by the P-score on the DIT-short form as a function of gender (male, female) and culture (Turkish, U.S.).

(5) Based on the evidence previously reviewed in the literature, it is hypothesized that there will be a significant ($p < .05$) interaction effect based on culture (Turkish, U.S.) and gender (male, female) for the justice orientation as measured by the MMO. Subhypotheses include:

- a) There will be a significant ($p < .05$) main effect for culture such that U.S. participants will have higher justice scores than the Turkish participants.
- b) There will be a significant ($p < .05$) main effect for gender such that male participants will have higher justice scores than the female participants.

(6) Based on the evidence previously reviewed in the literature, there will be a significant ($p < .05$) interaction effect based on culture (Turkish, U.S.) and gender (male, female) for the care orientation as measured by the MMO. Subhypotheses include:

- c) There will not be a main effect for culture as there will be no difference in the care scores of the U.S. and Turkish participants.
- d) There will be a significant ($p < .05$) main effect for gender such that female participants will have higher care scores than the male participants.

CHAPTER 2

METHODOLOGY

Sample

A total of 324 Turkish and U.S. university students participated in this cross-cultural study. The Turkish sample consisted of 193 undergraduate students between the ages of 18 and 33 (freshmen – 5, sophomores – 92, juniors – 36, seniors – 33) (27 participants did not report their classification). There were 66 males (34.2%) and 125 females (64.8%) (2 participants did not report their gender—1%), with an average age of 20.69 years. Turkish participants were recruited from 3 universities in Ankara: Hacettepe University (Department of American Culture and Literature—7 males-31 females), Ankara University (Department of Psychological Studies in Education—27 males-59 females), and the Middle East Technical University (Department of Foreign Language Education—32 males-35 females). The sample from Turkey included 59 participants from İç Anadolu region, 30 participants from Ege, 28 from Akdeniz, 27 from Marmara, 21 from Karadeniz, 6 from Doğu Anadolu, 5 from Güney Doğu Anadolu, 1 from Orta Anadolu, 2 from Cyprus, 1 from Kyrgyzstan, and 1 from Tajikistan (12 participants did not report the region in which they lived). A total of 155 of the participants came from an “urban area” (80.3%), 26 came from a “town” (13.5%), and 9 came from a “rural area” (4.7%) (3 participants did not complete this item—1.6%).

A total of 115 Turkish participants reported family income as “less than \$6000” (59.6%), 70 as “\$6000-17,000” (36.3%), and 5 as “over \$17,000” (2.6%) (3 participants did not report family income—1.6%). The majority of the Turkish participants reported their fathers’ education level as having completed a college degree (62) and their mothers’ education level as having completed only elementary school (82). Most of the Turkish participants’ mothers (131) were homemakers and fathers (35) were self-employed.

The U.S. sample consisted of 131 undergraduate students between the ages of 18 and 46 (freshmen – 22, sophomores – 39, juniors – 45, seniors – 20) (5 participants did not report their classification). There were 12 males (9.2%) and 113 females (86.3%) (6 participants did not report their gender—4.6%), with an average age of 21.73 years. U.S. participants were recruited from the Department of Counseling, Development, and Higher Education at the University of North Texas. The sample obtained in the U.S. included 98 participants from Texas (74.8%), 4 participants from Oklahoma, 3 from Virginia, 2 from Arkansas, 2 from Florida, 2 from Minnesota, 2 from New Jersey, 1 from Kansas, 1 from Mississippi, 1 from Nebraska, 1 from Illinois, 2 from Japan, 1 from India, 1 from Spain, and 1 from England (9 participants did not complete this item). Almost all U.S. participants came from an “urban area.” Only 3 participants reported family income as “less than \$10,000,” 15 as “\$10-19,000,” 18 as “\$20-40,000,” 45 as “\$45-100,000,” and 11 as “\$110-200,000” (39 participants did not report family income). The majority of the U.S. participants reported both their fathers’

and mothers' education level as having completed high school (60 and 68, respectively). Most of the U.S. participants' mothers (29) were homemakers and fathers (20) were in management.

The mean age for the entire sample was 21.11 years, and most of the participants were sophomores (131) (freshmen – 27, juniors – 81, seniors – 53). Both Turkish and the U.S. samples included students from lower class-to upper-middle-class families. However, it was observed that compared to the Turkish participants, most of the U.S. participants had higher family incomes.

Instruments

Instruments for this study included the Defining Issues Test (the DIT-short form) (Rest, 1986) and the Measure of Moral Orientation (MMO) (Liddell et al., 1992). In addition, each participant completed a consent form and a demographic questionnaire.

The Defining Issues Test

The DIT-short form is an objective multiple choice test originally stemming from Kohlberg's work on the development of moral reasoning (Moon, 1986). Like most other tests of moral judgment, the DIT is concerned with making judgments about moral problems. It is not only interested in what line of action subjects favor (i.e., to steal or not steal a drug), but also interested in subjects' reasons underlying their decisions (Rest, 1986).

The DIT-short form consists of 3 dilemma stories. For each moral dilemma, the DIT includes 12 item statements that can be used to resolve the problem. The items

reflect different moral stages (Gielen & Markoulis, 1994). After reading each story, subjects are expected to read each item and to rate its importance in their decision-making process. After rating each item individually, subjects rank the four most important items (Rest, 1986).

The DIT provides moral stage scores for Stages 2, 3, 4, 4 1/2, 5A, 5B, and 6. Preferences for postconventional reasoning (Stages 5A, 5B, and 6, combined) are represented by the P-score. The P-score expresses the percentage of a participant's rankings which fall in the postconventional range (Gielen & Markoulis, 1994). "Stage 5A represents considerations that focus on organizing a society by appealing to consensus-producing procedures (such as abiding by majority vote), insisting on due process (giving everyone his day in court), and safeguarding minimal basic rights" (Rest & Narvaez, 1998, p. 19). Stage 5B/6, on the other hand, includes "considerations that focus on organizing social arrangements and relationships in terms of intuitively appealing ideals" (Rest & Narvaez, 1998, p. 19). According to Kohlberg, 5B reasoners "have a keener appreciation of the prescriptive and universalizable nature of moral judgments" (Lapsley, 1996, p. 66); therefore, they are more likely to exhibit moral behavior they believe to be just.

The DIT contains 3 validity and consistency checks to establish whether the person taking the test understands it and is reasonably careful in filling it out. Among the 72 items, there are a few "meaningless" items (M-items) based upon lofty sounding, but senseless statements. Respondents endorsing a number of the

pretentious sounding, but meaningless moral arguments are frequently removed from the research sample. A second checking procedure looks for consistency between items rated high and items ranked high. A third checking procedure determines whether a protocol reflects response sets on the rating task. Should there be too many “inconsistent” respondents in a cross-cultural study, the researcher may suspect a lack of cultural-cognitive fit between the task requirements and/or moral conceptions underlying the DIT and the minds of the respondents. (Gielen & Markoulis, 1994, p. 80)

As mentioned in the literature review section, the DIT is the most frequently used moral judgment measure in the moral development literature (Gielen, 1996). The reliability and validity of the DIT were demonstrated to be very good in America. It had a high test-retest reliability (.82 and .77 for 6-and 3-story forms, respectively) and internal consistency (Cronbach’s Alpha = .77 and .76 for 6-and 3-story forms, respectively) (Moon, 1986).

To determine criterion group validity, Rest (1986) used the DIT on the most sophisticated group (a group of Ph.D. students in moral philosophy and political science) and on the youngest and least educated group (ninth graders) that could take the test. The expectation was the scores of the doctoral students would be higher than those of the ninth graders. Indeed, group differences were highly statistically significant, consistent with Rest’s expectations. In general, junior high students’ DIT

scores average in the 20s, senior high students average in the 30s, college students in the 40s, students in professional school programs in the 50s, and moral philosophy/political science PhD students in the 60s.

Rest (1986) conducted several longitudinal studies to examine whether there would be change in the direction of higher stages for subjects who were retested. Results indicated significant upward trends over 4 years at 3 testings ($F = 20.1, p < .001$) for P-scores. Similarly, analyses of individual patterns of change indicated an upward trend. Both cohort-sequential and time-sequential analyses showed this upward movement could not result from cultural change, testing effects, or sampling bias, but rather resulted from individual ontogenetic change.

To establish convergent-divergent correlations, several studies were conducted. Results showed the correlations with other measures of moral reasoning (various versions of Kohlberg's test and the Comprehension of Moral Concepts test) ranged in the .60s and .70s. The correlations were in the .20s to .50s range with other measures of cognitive development and intelligence. The correlations were mostly non-significant or inconsistent with various measures of attitudes and personality. Similarly, the correlations were usually non-significant or very low with demographic or sociological variables such as sex, socioeconomic class, and political party (Rest, 1986).

As mentioned in the literature review section, in 1986 Moon reviewed cross-cultural studies using the DIT. In the studies conducted in Brazil, Greece, Iceland, Israel, and Korea the short version was used. In the study completed in Brazil, test-retest reliability was low ($r = .39$). In the Korean study, however, the reliability of the

DIT was high ($r = .69$). The remaining 3 studies did not provide any information about the reliability of their research. Among the studies using the long version of the DIT, only the studies completed in Australia, Hong Kong, and the Philippines provided information about the reliability of their data. The DIT used in Hong Kong had a low test-retest reliability ($r = .32$). The reliability of the DIT used in Australia ($r = .98$) and the Philippines ($r = .74$) was high. Only 2 studies reported internal consistency measures. Alpha was .50 for the Hong Kong sample and .66 for the Australian sample.

The Measure of Moral Orientation

The Measure of Moral Orientation is a paper-and-pencil objective test. It has been developed to measure a participants' moral orientations for care, as stressed by Gilligan, or justice, as stressed by Kohlberg (Liddell et al., 1992).

The Measure of Moral Orientation (MMO) consists of 2 parts. The first part includes 9 stories in each of which a young adult is placed in conflict. Each story has a different number of items. After reading each story, subjects are expected to read each item and indicate to what degree they agree or disagree with that item. The second part is composed of a self-description questionnaire that contains 14 (7 self-justice and 7 self-care) items. In this part, subjects are also expected to read each item and indicate to what degree they agree or disagree with that item (Liddell et al., 1992). The MMO consists of "35" care items and "34" justice items. However, one of the "care" items (no. 26) was accidentally omitted during the translation process. For that reason, this item was omitted from the overall care score for both the Turkish and U.S. participants in this study.

The analyses completed to determine the reliability and validity of the Measure of Moral Orientation can be summarized as follows:

“An estimate of internal consistency reliability, Cronbach’s coefficient alpha, was computed for each of the four scales of the Measure of Moral Orientation as well as the thinking-feeling scale of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator” (Liddell et al., 1992, p. 328). The alpha coefficient was .59 for self-care, .60 for self-justice, .84 for care, and .73 for justice. Internal consistency reliability estimates obtained for the Measure of Moral Orientation were found to be comparable to or better than those indicated for other instruments measuring moral development. For the thinking-feeling scale of the Myers- Briggs Type Indicator, estimates were found to be consistent with published reports for that instrument (Liddell et al.).

Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were computed to establish convergent validity. The correlation between justice and self-justice was .22, and the correlation between care and self-care was .32. Again, Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were computed to establish discriminant validity (i.e., the probability of an instrument’s discriminating between dissimilar traits). The correlation between justice and care was .17; between self-justice and self-care, $-.44$; and between thinking and feeling on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, $-.92$. As there was an almost perfect negative correlation between the thinking and feeling scores, it was decided to use only one of the two scores from the thinking-feeling scale. The thinking score was applied as the only covariate in all analyses because internal consistency reliability was found to be higher for the thinking scale ($r = .85$) than for the feeling scale ($r = .76$),

and “the thinking scale correlated more highly with the criterion of care ($r = -.38$)” (Liddell et al., 1992, p. 329). The scales were considered to be independent of each other as the correlations between different traits were found to be relatively low and, thus, the instrument was considered to be correctly discriminating between unlike scales (Liddell et al.).

The demographic questionnaire used in this study included questions about the participant’s age, gender, marital status, major, family income, parents’ occupation, level of education, and marital status. The consent form, demographic questionnaire, and the instruments used with the Turkish university students were printed in Turkish. They were translated by a teacher who worked in the Department of English as a Foreign Language Education of the Middle East Technical University in Ankara, Turkey. The translations of the DIT and MMO were later compared with the originals by a Turkish person who did his PhD in the United States.

After the translation of the DIT was done, it was found that another Turkish version of the DIT had been previously developed. The older Turkish version, which was translated by Sevim Cesur, a graduate student in Turkey, was used in a study comparing the moral reasoning of Turkish male and female university students and provided valid results (Cesur, 1997). In light of this new information, the author compared both Turkish versions of the DIT and communicated with Sevim Cesur to ensure changes to the new version reflected superior sections of Sevim Cesur’s translation. This way, the author believed the Turkish version used in this study is an improved Turkish translation of the DIT.

Procedures

The UNT Institutional Review Board reviewed and approved all instruments, questionnaires, and consent forms utilized in this study prior to the beginning of data collection.

The principal investigator (PI) neither collected the data nor recruited the students in person in Turkey. Instead, the university instructors whose students were used as subjects for the research helped the PI collect the data. U.S. students were also collected through contacts with instructors. Following approval of course instructors, both U.S. and Turkish students were given a packet of materials containing the consent form, the demographic questionnaire, and the instruments (the DIT and MMO). Participants were asked to take the packet home, complete the materials, and return the completed packet to the university instructor. A total of 56 Turkish participants completed the materials during the regular class-session, while 137 Turkish participants and all the U.S participants (131) completed the materials at home. After participants returned the completed packet to their university instructor, materials were forwarded to the researcher.

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

All statistical analyses were done using SPSS for Windows (2001).

The Analyses of The DIT

A total of 193 Turkish university students completed the DIT. However, 18 of the Turkish participants (10 males and 8 females) did not pass the DIT's consistency check. Therefore, they were excluded from analyses, leaving 175 Turkish participants. A total of 131 U.S. university students completed the DIT. However, 27 of the U.S. participants (6 males, 20 females, and 1 participant who did not report his/her gender) did not pass the DIT's consistency check and were excluded from analyses, leaving 104 U.S. participants. As a result, a total of 279 students were included in the analyses of the DIT (56 Turkish males, 117 Turkish females, and 2 Turkish participants who did not report their gender – 6 U.S. males, 93 U.S. females, and 5 U.S. participants who did not report their gender).

The Analyses of Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 predicted that in both the U.S. and Turkish cultures, the moral reasoning of both males and females would reflect Kohlberg's stages 2, 3, 4, 5A, 5B, and 6, and there would be no significant ($p > .05$) difference based on culture in the stage scores for moral reasoning. The analyses of the DIT-short form showed reasoning across each of Kohlberg's moral stages among both genders from both countries, consistent with the expectations.

Results of t-test analyses indicated:

- (a) The mean score of Stage 2 reasoning of U.S. participants was significantly ($p < .001$) higher than the mean score of Stage 2 reasoning of Turkish participants;
- (b) No significant ($p > .05$) difference in the mean score of Stage 3 reasoning between U.S. and Turkish participants; however, the p value approached significance at 0.054;
- (c) The mean score of Stage 4 reasoning of U.S. participants was significantly ($p < .001$) higher than the mean score of Stage 4 reasoning of Turkish participants;
- (d) The mean score of Stage 5A reasoning of Turkish participants was significantly ($p < .01$) higher than the mean score of Stage 5A reasoning of U.S. participants;
- (e) The mean score of Stage 5B reasoning of Turkish participants was significantly ($p < .001$) higher than the mean score of Stage 5B reasoning of U.S. participants;
- (f) No significant ($p > .05$) difference in the mean score of Stage 6 reasoning between U.S. and Turkish participants (see Table 1).

Table 1

T-test results for Hypothesis 1.

	Group	<i>n</i>	Mean	s.d.	df	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Stage 2	U.S.	104	5.33	4.81	159.87	-5.52	.000
	Turkey	175	2.39	3.26			
Stage 3	U.S.	104	12.29	8.07	277	1.93	.054
	Turkey	175	14.23	8.16			
Stage 4	U.S.	104	22.45	9.66	277	-6.33	.000
	Turkey	175	15.46	8.45			
Stage 5A	U.S.	104	10.83	7.16	277	3.45	.001
	Turkey	175	13.78	6.79			
Stage 5B	U.S.	104	1.37	2.56	263.46	8.82	.000
	Turkey	175	4.56	3.44			
Stage 6	U.S.	104	2.95	3.55	277	.728	.467
	Turkey	175	3.25	3.37			

The Analyses of Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 predicted the Stage 5A and Stage 5B mean scores for females would be significantly ($p < .05$) higher than the Stage 5A and Stage 5B mean scores for males. A total of 272 participants (62 males and 210 females) were used in the stage comparisons of the two genders.

Results of t-test analyses indicated:

- (a) No significant ($p > .05$) difference in the mean score of Stage 5A reasoning between male and female participants.
- (b) No significant ($p > .05$) difference in the mean score of Stage 5B reasoning between male and female participants (see Table 2).

Table 2

T-test results for Hypothesis 2.

	Gender	<i>n</i>	Mean	s.d.	df	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Stage 5A	Male	62	12.08	6.31	270	-.967	.334
	Female	210	13.06	7.25			
Stage 5B	Male	62	3.90	3.56	270	1.23	.221
	Female	210	3.27	3.48			

The Analyses of Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 predicted that the mean score of Stage 4 reasoning for males would be significantly ($p < .05$) higher than the mean score of Stage 4 reasoning for females. However, results of t-test analyses indicated no significant ($p > .05$) difference in the mean score of Stage 4 reasoning between male and female participants (see Table 3).

Table 3

T-test results for Hypothesis 3.

	Gender	<i>n</i>	Mean	s.d.	df	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Stage 4	Male	62	16.75	8.38	270	-1.15	.250
	Female	210	18.34	9.86			

The Analyses of Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 4 predicted there would be a significant ($p < .05$) difference in postconventional reasoning based on gender (male, female) and culture (Turkish, U.S.). Results of the 2 X 2 ANOVA indicated a significant ($p < .05$) main effect in postconventional reasoning based on culture, but no main effect for gender ($p > .05$). The interaction effect was also not significant ($p > .05$) (see Table 4).

Table 4

ANOVA results for Hypothesis 4.

DIT P-score by culture and gender

	df	F	η	p
Culture (C)	1	13.32	.22	.00
Gender (G)	1	2.25	.09	.14
C X G	1	.01	.00	.93
Error	268 (206.88)			

Note: Values enclosed in parentheses represent mean square errors.

Group means:	Mean	n
Turkey:	36.16	173
males	32.67	56
females	37.84	117
US:	25.42	99
males	21.11	6
females	25.69	93
Total:		
males	31.56	62
females	32.46	210

The Analyses of the MMO

The Analyses of Hypotheses 5 and 6

Hypothesis 5 predicted a significant interaction effect based on culture and gender for the justice orientation. Hypotheses of main effects predicted U.S. participants would yield significantly ($p < .05$) higher justice scores than Turkish participants and male participants would yield significantly ($p < .05$) higher justice scores than female participants. Hypothesis 6 predicted a significant interaction effect based on culture and gender for the care orientation. Hypotheses of main effects predicted no main effect for culture, but main effects for gender such that female participants would yield significantly ($p < .05$) higher care scores than male participants.

Results of the 2 X 2 ANOVA indicated there was not a significant ($p > .05$) interaction effect for the justice orientation based on culture and gender. However, results did indicate significant ($p < .001$) main effects for both culture and gender, indicating Turkish participants scored significantly higher on the justice orientation than the U.S. participants and females scored significantly higher on the justice orientation than the males.

Similarly, results of the 2 X 2 ANOVA indicated there was not a significant ($p > .05$) interaction effect for the care orientation based on culture and gender. However, results did indicate significant ($p < .001$) main effects for both culture and gender, indicating Turkish participants scored significantly higher on the care orientation than the U.S. participants and females scored significantly higher on the care orientation than the males (see Tables 5 and 6).

Table 5

ANOVA results for Hypothesis 5.

Justice score by culture and gender

	df	F	η	p
Culture (C)	1	12.65	.20	.00
Gender (G)	1	11.06	.19	.00
C X G	1	.33	.03	.57
error	308 (77.18)			

Note: Values enclosed in parentheses represent mean square errors.

Group means:	Mean	n
Turkey:	65.56	191
males	68.24	66
females	64.14	125
US:	69.17	121
males	77.42	12
females	68.59	109
Total:		
males	69.19	78
females	66.21	234

Note: Lower values indicate higher levels.

Table 6

ANOVA results for Hypothesis 6.

Care score by culture and gender				
	df	F	η	p
Culture (C)	1	19.23	.24	.00
Gender (G)	1	18.44	.24	.00
C X G	1	.01	.00	.92
error	308 (107.75)			

Note: Values enclosed in parentheses represent mean square errors.

Group means:	Mean	n
Turkey:	62.82	191
males	67.67	66
females	60.26	125
US:	68.60	121
males	75.58	12
females	67.83	109
Total:		
males	68.88	78
females	63.79	234

Note: Lower values indicate higher levels.

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Discussion

This study compared American and Turkish university students in terms of moral orientation (justice and care) and Kohlberg's stages of moral reasoning to be able to assess the influence of culture and gender on moral development. This study was conducted with university students in order to better control for level of education. Without controlling the education level of participants, unbiased sampling becomes difficult and educational differences may influence moral reasoning and orientation significantly.

Results of this study may be analyzed in terms of cultural and gender differences. With regard to cultural differences, based on the lack of clear results regarding cultural differences in moral stages in the literature, Hypothesis 1 predicted no significant difference in the mean score of moral reasoning of Stages 2, 3, 4, 5A, 5B, and 6 between U.S. and Turkish populations. Hypothesis 1 implied cultural differences between U.S. and Turkish societies were not significant factors on moral reasoning of university students included in this study.

However, results of this study did not entirely confirm Hypothesis 1. While there was no significant difference in the mean score of Stage 3 and Stage 6 reasoning between U.S. and Turkish participants, U.S. participants did have significantly higher Stage 2 and Stage 4 scores than the Turkish participants. Further, the Turkish

participants had significantly higher Stage 5A and Stage 5B scores than the U.S. participants. Overall, these findings indicate culture may be a significant factor influencing moral reasoning for the participants in this study.

Research shows the United States is the most individualistic culture in the world (Kozan & Ergin, 1998). “Individualist cultures emphasize values that serve the self by making the self feel good, be distinguished, and be independent” (Schwartz, 1990, p. 140). In these societies personal goals are given priority over the goals of the in-group. Collectivist cultures, on the other hand, “emphasize values that serve the in-group by subordinating personal goals for the sake of preserving in-group integrity, interdependence of members, and harmonious relationships” (Schwartz, 1990, p. 140). Traditional Turkish culture is characterized as a group-oriented culture reflecting collectivistic values (Phalet & Claeys, 1993). Therefore, traditional Turkish people might be expected to reflect more Stage 3 morality which emphasizes affection, conformity, and loyalty within a primary group (Ma & Cheung, 1996) compared to American people. No significant difference in Stage 3 reasoning between cultures for the participants in this study is a surprising result given that Turkey is a collectivist and the U.S is an individualist society.

However, this study was carried out with university students. As mentioned in the literature review section, modern Turkish youth has been observed to carry signs of both individualism and collectivism (Kozan & Ergin, 1998). In fact, Phalet and Claeys (1993) found individualistic self-realization, freedom, independence, and responsibility were among the most preferred values in modern Turkish youth. This suggests Turkish

youth may tend to give priority to personal goals over group goals, which is in contradiction with Stage 3 morality. When the university students included in this sample are considered as the modern, educated youth in Turkey, Phalet and Claeys's research results are consistent with the findings reported here.

In individualist societies such as the U.S, individuals “maintain each other's individualistic interest in the socially conventional and legal context” (Ma & Cheung, 1996, p. 703). Therefore, law is very important and it is utilized in the resolution of conflicts. The U.S. government has been strong in enforcing the law, and the U.S. legal system has been strong in providing justice. The author believes both factors play roles in the creation of a justice seeking and law abiding culture. The author also believes that, in comparison to the U.S., Turkish law enforcement and legal system have not been as strong; therefore, law and justice have not become such a strong influence to Turkish culture. For that reason, it can be expected that the U.S. population may reflect more Stage 4 reasoning, as the results of this study confirm. This finding is consistent with previous studies that indicate U.S. participants tend to receive higher Stage 4 scores than do participants from collectivistic cultures. In fact, U.S. students were observed to receive significantly higher Stage 4 scores than students from Hong Kong, Belize, and Korea (Ma & Cheung, 1996; Gielen, Cruickshank, Johnston, Swanzey, & Avellani, 1986; Park & Johnson, 1984).

As mentioned before, individualistic societies emphasize the importance of “the worth, dignity, and autonomy of the individual person, including the subjective self or inner life of the person” (Lickona, 1991, p. 9). For this reason, these societies tend to

give priority to rights and freedom more than responsibility and commitment and, thus, individuals tend to consider and fulfill themselves as free individuals rather than to meet their obligations as members of groups (Lickona). In other words, in these societies individuals tend to consider and be responsive primarily to the self's needs (Miller, 1994). As the U.S. is an individualistic society (Kozan & Ergin, 1998), the U.S. population can be expected to reflect more Stage 2 reasoning which represents "instrumental relativist orientation, where the idea of morally right behavior is confused with what satisfies one's own needs" (Park & Johnson, 1984, p. 35), as the results of this study confirm. This finding is consistent with previous studies that indicate U.S. participants tend to receive higher Stage 2 scores than do participants from collectivistic cultures. In fact, U.S. students were observed to receive higher Stage 2 scores than students from Belize, Trinidad, and Korea (Gielen et al., 1986; Park & Johnson, 1984).

In the literature, there is evidence females tend to yield higher P-scores (Tolunay, 2001; Cesur, 1997; Gielen, 1996; Eisenberg et al., 1995; Beller & Stoll, 1995; Gielen & Markoulis, 1994; Moon, 1986) and males tend to yield higher Stage 4 scores (Moon, 1986). Motivated by these research results, Hypothesis 2 predicted the mean score of Stage 5A and Stage 5B reasoning of females would be significantly higher than the mean score of Stage 5A and Stage 5B reasoning of males included in this sample, and Hypothesis 3 predicted the mean score of Stage 4 reasoning of males would be significantly higher than the mean score of Stage 4 reasoning of females included in this sample. Both hypotheses implied a significant gender influence on

moral reasoning. However, results did not confirm Hypotheses 2 and 3, implying gender for these subjects was not a significant factor for moral reasoning in Stage 4, Stage 5A, and Stage 5B. Results indicated no significant difference in the mean score of Stage 4, Stage 5A, and Stage 5B reasoning between male and female participants in this study.

To better examine differences in Stage 4, Stage 5A, and Stage 5B reasoning as a function of culture and gender in this sample, additional analyses were conducted comparing reasoning between Turkish males, Turkish females, and U.S. females. U.S. males were removed from analyses due to the small sample ($n = 6$). Results of the Oneway ANOVA examining differences in Stage 4 reasoning indicated an overall significant ($p < .001$) difference between the 3 groups examined. Results of the Tukey planned comparisons indicated Stage 4 reasoning of U.S. females was significantly ($p < .001$) higher than Stage 4 reasoning of Turkish males and Turkish females. However, no significant ($p > .05$) difference was found in the mean score of Stage 4 reasoning between Turkish males and Turkish females.

In addition, results of a Oneway ANOVA indicated an overall significant difference in Stage 5A ($p < .01$) and Stage 5B ($p < .001$) reasoning between the 3 groups examined. Results of the Tukey planned comparisons indicated the mean score of Stage 5A and Stage 5B reasoning of Turkish females was significantly ($p < .05$) higher than the mean score of Stage 5A and Stage 5B reasoning of U.S. females. While no significant ($p > .05$) difference was found in the mean score of Stage 5A reasoning between Turkish males and U.S. females, results indicated that the mean score of Stage

5B reasoning of Turkish males was significantly ($p < .05$) higher than the mean score of Stage 5B reasoning of U.S. females. However, no significant ($p > .05$) difference was found in the mean score of Stage 5A and Stage 5B reasoning between Turkish males and Turkish females (see Tables 7, 8, and 9).

To summarize, no significant difference was found between male and female participants in Stages 4, 5A, and 5B during testing of the hypotheses. Post hoc analyses, removing the sample of U.S. males due to the small number ($n = 6$), indicated there was no significant difference between Turkish males and Turkish females in Stages 4, 5A, and 5B. However, post hoc analyses also indicated the mean score of Stage 4 reasoning of U.S. females was significantly higher than the mean score of Stage 4 reasoning of Turkish males, while the mean score of Stage 5B reasoning of Turkish males was significantly higher than the mean score of Stage 5B reasoning of U.S. females. These findings suggest culture not gender may have a key role in the development of Stages 4, 5A, and 5B for this sample. However, it is also interesting to note that gender differences between Turkish males and Turkish females did approach significance with regard to Stage 5A ($p = .096$) and Stage 5B ($p = .073$) reasoning.

Table 7

Results of Oneway ANOVA for Stage 4.

Source	df	F	<i>p</i>	η
Between groups	2	21.09	.000	.138
Within groups	263			
Total	265			
Tukey Planned Comparisons				
Groups	<i>n</i>	Mean	s.d.	
1 – Turkish males	56	16.43 ^a	8.17	
2 – Turkish females	117	14.87 ^a	8.58	
3 – U.S. females	93	22.70 ^b	9.68	
Significant differences between groups:			<i>p</i>	
Group 1 vs. Group 2			.524	
Group 1 vs. Group 3			.000	
Group 2 vs. Group 3			.000	

Table 8

Results of Oneway ANOVA for Stage 5A.

Source	df	F	<i>p</i>	η
Between groups	2	5.83	.003	.042
Within groups	263			
Total	265			
Tukey Planned Comparisons				
Groups	<i>n</i>	Mean	s.d.	
1 – Turkish males	56	12.69 ab	6.19	
2 – Turkish females	117	14.51 a	6.89	
3 – U.S. females	93	11.25 b	7.32	
Significant differences between groups:			<i>p</i>	
Group 1 vs. Group 2			.239	
Group 1 vs. Group 3			.430	
Group 2 vs. Group 3			.002	

Table 9

Results of Oneway ANOVA for Stage 5B.

Source	df	F	<i>p</i>	η
Between groups	2	36.19	.000	.216
Within groups	263			
Total	265			
Tukey Planned Comparisons				
Groups	<i>n</i>	Mean	s.d.	
1 – Turkish males	56	3.88 a	3.59	
2 – Turkish females	117	4.89 a	3.33	
3 – U.S. females	93	1.25 b	2.47	
Significant differences between groups:			<i>p</i>	
Group 1 vs. Group 2			.117	
Group 1 vs. Group 3			.000	
Group 2 vs. Group 3			.000	

As mentioned in the literature review section, Gilligan claims Stage 3 represents females' moral reasoning, whereas Stage 4 reflects males' moral reasoning (Lyons, 1996). According to Gilligan (1982), women score lower than men on Kohlberg's moral reasoning test as women prefer the lower stages (particularly Stage 3) or care-

based stages. Analysis of Gilligan's claim using this sample was conducted in addition to the hypotheses reviewed earlier to examine differences in Stage 3 reasoning as a function of culture and gender. U.S. males were removed from analysis due to the small sample ($n = 6$).

Results of a Oneway ANOVA indicated an overall significant ($p < .05$) difference between the 3 groups examined. Post hoc analyses using Tukey planned comparisons indicated there was no significant ($p > .05$) difference in the mean score of Stage 3 reasoning between Turkish males and Turkish females, whereas the mean score of Stage 3 reasoning of Turkish males was significantly ($p < .01$) higher than the mean score of Stage 3 reasoning of U.S. females. There was also no significant ($p > .05$) difference in the mean score of Stage 3 reasoning between Turkish females and U.S. females (see Table 10). These findings can be said to be in contradiction with previous studies that indicate females tend to receive higher Stage 3 scores than do males (Moon, 1986; Snarey, 1985), and comparisons among these 3 groups suggest the difference in Stage 3 reasoning between Turkish males and U.S. females in this study may be a result of cultural not gender differences.

Table 10

Results of Oneway ANOVA for Stage 3.

Source	df	F	<i>p</i>	η
Between groups	2	3.71	.026	.027
Within groups	263			
Total	265			
Tukey Planned Comparisons				
Groups	<i>n</i>	Mean	s.d.	
1 – Turkish males	56	15.68 ^a	7.90	
2 – Turkish females	117	13.50 ^{ab}	8.20	
3 – U.S. females	93	11.94 ^b	8.15	
Significant differences between groups:			<i>p</i>	
Group 1 vs. Group 2			.225	
Group 1 vs. Group 3			.018	
Group 2 vs. Group 3			.350	

Hypothesis 4 examined interaction effects between gender and culture in postconventional reasoning. Results indicated a significant difference in postconventional reasoning based on culture, but not for gender. In other words, results indicated Turkish participants exhibited significantly more postconventional reasoning

than did U.S. participants. However, there was no significant difference in postconventional reasoning between male and female participants. These results are consistent with the results obtained from Hypotheses 2 and 3.

As mentioned before, Snarey's (1985) review of cross-cultural studies on Kohlberg's stages showed that in comparison with the scores of the samples from collectivistic cultures, the American P-scores were about average. In fact, moral maturity scores of Taiwanese, Israeli Kibbutz, and Indian participants were higher than those of American participants in one or more age divisions and Turkish urban participants ranked higher than working-class participants in the U.S. Moon (1986), in his review of cross-cultural studies on the DIT, on the other hand, found results contradicting Snarey's observations. Moon observed samples reflecting the characteristics of American culture received the highest P-scores. In fact, American students' P-scores were higher than their Mexican, Korean, Chinese, and Saudi Arabian counterparts. As a result of their review of cross-cultural studies on the DIT, Gielen and Markoulis (1994) observed North American, European, and the East Asian college and university students received similar P-scores. P-scores of participants from less developed countries such as Belize, Nigeria, and Trinidad-Tobago were lower than those of participants from the more industrialized nations in Europe, North America, and East Asia. To summarize, the existing literature does not provide a definitive ranking on U.S. postconventional reasoning with respect to other cultures.

A possible explanation to the difference in P-scores between the U.S. and Turkish participants can be as follows: The collectivistic nature of the traditional

Turkish culture (Phalet & Claeys, 1993) may enable its individuals to maintain close relationships and close communication ties with each other and these interconnected relationships may enable individuals to gain experience in solving difficult social dilemmas similar to those in the DIT. As Turkish people grow up having such experiences, being aware of the lives of others, gaining insight into each other's perspectives, feelings, and thoughts, the law may become a relatively less important factor in their social decision-making. In contrast, the more individualistic nature of the U.S. may leave its individuals relatively inexperienced in dealing with social problems. As the U.S. has a justice seeking culture (Miller, 1994), individuals may have a tendency to rely more frequently on matters of law (as reflected in their higher levels of Stage 4 reasoning) in resolving social dilemmas.

To better examine differences in postconventional reasoning as a function of culture and gender in this sample, additional analyses were conducted comparing reasoning between Turkish males, Turkish females, and U.S. females. U.S. males were removed from analyses due to the small sample ($n = 6$). Results of a Oneway ANOVA indicated an overall significant ($p < .001$) difference in postconventional reasoning. Results of the Tukey planned comparisons indicated differences in postconventional reasoning between the Turkish male and Turkish female samples approached significance ($p = .072$) in that postconventional reasoning of Turkish females was slightly higher than that of Turkish males. This result can be said to be consistent with Cesur (1997) and Tolunay's (2001) research findings that Turkish female university students' overall reasoning was higher than Turkish male university students'. In

addition, postconventional reasoning of both Turkish males and Turkish females in this study was significantly ($p<.01$) higher than postconventional reasoning of U.S. females (see Table 11). These scores still indicate culture may have a more significant effect than gender in moral decision-making.

According to the author, Turkish people are very interested in what happens to others and believe they have moral obligations to others. Helping and self-sacrifice become a moral duty, are seen as “doing the right thing,” and are highly valued in the society. The author believes Turkish female university students received the highest P-scores because they have experience with self-sacrificial and caring relationships in their own families and they have the education and maturity to generalize these experiences to any moral dilemma.

Table 11

Results of Oneway ANOVA for P-score.

Source	df	F	<i>p</i>	η
Between groups	2	18.31	.000	.122
Within groups	263			
Total	265			
Tukey Planned Comparisons				
Groups	<i>n</i>	Mean	s.d.	
1 – Turkish males	56	32.67 ^a	14.05	
2 – Turkish females	117	37.83 ^a	15.17	
3 – U.S. females	93	25.70 ^b	13.70	
Significant differences between groups:			<i>p</i>	
Group 1 vs. Group 2			.072	
Group 1 vs. Group 3			.012	
Group 2 vs. Group 3			.000	

Hypothesis 5 predicted a significant interaction effect based on culture and gender for the justice orientation. Hypotheses of main effects predicted U.S. participants would yield significantly higher justice scores than Turkish participants and male participants would yield significantly higher justice scores than female

participants. Results indicated Turkish participants scored significantly higher on the justice orientation than the U.S. participants and females scored significantly higher on the justice orientation than the males.

Hypothesis 6 predicted a significant interaction effect based on culture and gender for the care orientation. Hypotheses of main effects predicted no main effect for culture, but main effects for gender such that female participants would yield significantly higher care scores than male participants. Results indicated Turkish participants scored significantly higher on the care orientation than the U.S. participants and females scored significantly higher on the care orientation than the males.

As mentioned in the literature review section, Shweder et al. (1990) claim individualistic (Western) cultures have “a moral orientation towards autonomy, rights, and personal prerogative,” (Neff, 2001, p. 234) while collectivistic (non-Western) cultures have “a moral orientation towards connectedness, social duty, and interpersonal responsibility” (Neff, 2001, p. 234). This implies justice reasoning is more a characteristic of individualistic morality, while care reasoning is more a characteristic of collectivistic morality (Turiel, 1998). From this point of view, the U.S. population can be expected to be oriented toward justice reasoning and the Turkish population can be expected to be oriented toward care reasoning.

In fact, results of hypotheses showed Turkish participants reflected significantly more care orientation than did U.S. participants which is consistent with Shweder et al.’s (1990) ideas. However, Turkish participants also reflected significantly more justice orientation than did U.S. participants, contrary to Shweder et al.’s expectations.

This is a surprising result, given that the United States is a justice seeking culture (Miller, 1994) and the most individualistic country in the world (Kozan & Ergin, 1998). These findings can be said to be consistent with Shweder et al.'s claim that collectivistic (non-Western) cultures reflect care reasoning or "duty-based" morality, but in contradiction with their claim that justice reasoning or "rights-based" morality is a characteristic of individualistic (Western) societies.

In modern Turkey, there are strong traditions based on care and responsibility (Lyons, 1996). At the same time, there is a lack of equality, individual rights, and freedoms. For this reason, even though Turkish people are historically care oriented, they are very sensitive and responsive to issues related to justice. Also, during the last century, the political leaders of modern Turkey set the Western culture as the model for the country, which influenced the public significantly toward modernization, equality, and individual rights, especially women's rights. The author believes these factors might explain high justice scores of the Turkish participants.

To summarize, the findings of this study support previous studies that indicate individualistic concerns are also present in the thought and behavior of people in collectivistic (non-Western) societies (Turiel & Wainryb, 2000). In fact, research shows "self-interested goals and concerns with personal entitlements are part of the thinking of the Balinese, Indians, Pakistanis, Nepalese, and Japanese" (Turiel, 1998, p. 916). Arab Druze people living in Israel have been found to "endorse individual freedoms and rights even when in contradiction with status and hierarchy" (Turiel, 1998, p. 914) as well as to endorse traditions and role distinctions. Research also shows "Americans

do endorse rights and freedoms, which have been associated with individualism, but they also subordinate freedoms to preventing harm, upholding traditions, asserting community standards, and maintaining social order” (Turiel, 1998, p. 914).

In light of these research findings it can be said that the justice and care orientations, or “rights-based” and “duty-based” moralities, can coexist strongly in cultures, regardless of western – non-western, individualist – collectivist classifications.

As mentioned in the literature review, Gilligan (1982) claims justice and care orientations are basically linked to gender. According to her, women predominantly use the care-oriented moral reasoning, while men predominantly use the justice-oriented moral reasoning. To better examine gender differences in moral orientation, additional analyses were conducted. Results of t-test analyses for this sample indicated Turkish and U.S. males did not exhibit significant differences in the justice and care orientations. Results also indicated Turkish females exhibited significantly more care orientation than justice orientation, while U.S. females did not exhibit significant differences in the justice and care orientations (see Tables 12, 13, 14, and 15).

As mentioned before, previous studies on moral orientation yield little support for the view that there is a generalized distinction between men and women in their orientations (Colby & Damon, 1994). The results of this study can be said to support these previous research findings, as Turkish males, U.S. males, and U.S. females included in this study did not exhibit significant difference in the justice and care orientations. Overall, these results indicate gender for the participants in this study is not a significant factor in the justice and care orientations, but a combination of culture

and gender can be significant. In other words, “the structure of the culture combined with gender related factors may play important roles in shaping moral orientation” (Lyons, 1996, p. 126).

Table 12

T-test results of justice and care orientations for Turkish males.

	Group	<i>n</i>	Mean	s.d.	df	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Justice	Turkish males	66	68.24	8.59	65	-.329	.743
Care			67.67	9.94			

Note: Lower values indicate higher levels.

Table 13

T-test results of justice and care orientations for U.S. males.

	Group	<i>n</i>	Mean	s.d.	df	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Justice	U.S. males	12	74.42	13.53	11	.458	.656
Care			75.58	15.08			

Note: Lower values indicate higher levels.

Table 14

T-test results of justice and care orientations for Turkish females.

	Group	<i>n</i>	Mean	s.d.	df	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Justice	Turkish females	125	64.14	7.82	124	-4.099	.000
Care			60.26	9.05			

Note: Lower values indicate higher levels.

Table 15

T-test results of justice and care orientations for U.S. females.

	Group	<i>n</i>	Mean	s.d.	df	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Justice	U.S. females	109	68.59	9.32	108	-.736	.464
Care			67.83	11.43			

Note: Lower values indicate higher levels.

Limitations of the Study and Suggestions for Future Research

An insufficient number of U.S. male participants ($n = 12$) are included in this study. Future research can duplicate the methods of this study using a more balanced distribution of male and female university students.

Compared to the Turkish participants, most of the U.S. participants had higher family incomes and the drop out rates of the U.S. participants on the DIT were more than those of Turkish participants. These factors may affect the results. Also, the majority of the U.S. sample consists of students taking “human development” and “parenting” classes which may be considered as non-random sampling. Similar can be said for the Turkish sample, which consists of students from the departments of Psychological Studies in Education, American Culture and Literature, and Foreign Language Education.

Suggestions for Future Application

Morality includes humane caring, objective thinking, and determined action. Individuals are expected to use these three elements of morality together in making their moral decisions. All the models developed for moral education represent the different ways “of thinking about the processes of caring, judging, and acting in an educational setting” (Hersh et al., 1980, p. 7). Each model includes a theory which answers the question of how individuals develop morally and a set of strategies for promoting moral development.

Studies on moral reasoning and moral orientation can make a significant impact on moral education. Results of such studies can be used in increasing the effectiveness of existing moral education models equally on both genders. These results can also be used in developing new moral education programs. Cross-cultural studies on moral development may be especially important for moral education. Using such cross-

cultural studies one can understand if existing moral education programs or models work in all cultures and promote the same values cross-culturally.

The results of this study are specific to university students and cannot be generalized to all ages. Moral education can be considered most effective at early ages; therefore, a cross-cultural study on children's moral reasoning can be more beneficial to moral education than the results of this study. On the other hand, the findings of this study can be used to improve the content of a moral education program offered to university students.

Conclusion

The results of this study support the existence of postconventional reasoning as defined by Kohlberg's theory in Turkey as well as in Western cultures, contrary to Shweder et al.'s (1990) claim. Between 1964 and 1976, Kohlberg found Turkish people to be less morally advanced with respect to their American counterparts. The results of this research contradict Kohlberg's findings. Turkish participants were found to reflect more postconventional reasoning, while U.S. participants were found to reflect more conventional reasoning, particularly Stage 4 reasoning. One reason can be the fact that education is controlled in this research. Another reason can be the modernization of Turkey during the last few decades. This implies culture may have a significant effect in moral decision-making.

Even though traditional Turkish culture is characterized as a group-oriented culture reflecting collectivistic values (Phalet & Claeys, 1993), in today's modern Turkey, individuals are expected "to find and express their own individuality" (Lyons,

1996, p. 135) and be aware of their individual rights. At the same time, they are also expected to be aware of responsibility for family and community. Therefore, in today's Turkey, the ideal Turkish citizen is one who makes a balance between being a rational modern citizen and being a caring person. This suggests Turkish people "while pushed towards being separate, objective, and justice oriented are pushed also by the communal nature of the culture towards reflection on relationship," (Lyons, 1996, p. 135) care, and responsibility. Therefore, ideal modern Turkish people characteristics which are expressed by university students can be said to be consistent with the characteristics of Kohlberg's postconventional level, which represents the integration of the justice and care orientations (Spiecker, 1994).

Turkish females were found to exhibit significantly more care orientation than justice orientation; however, U.S. males, U.S. females, and Turkish males did not exhibit significant difference in the justice and care orientations, contrary to Gilligan's expectations. These findings suggest not gender alone, but a combination of culture and gender may play an important role in shaping moral orientation. Turkish participants were observed to reflect significantly more care orientation and more justice orientation compared to U.S. participants. Overall, these results imply justice and care orientations cannot be seen as characteristics peculiar to one gender or culture (Li, 1994).

APPENDIX A

Participant Consent Form

Dear Participant,

I am a student at the University of North Texas working on my master's degree in Counseling, Development and Higher Education. My research interest is cross-cultural comparisons of reasoning skills of Turkish university students with that of American counterparts.

My study does not deal with the individual answers of the participants, but merely concerns with how the university students of these two cultures generally make judgments about problems.

If you decide to participate in my study, you will be expected to complete two questionnaires which deal with your knowledge, attitudes and opinions regarding a variety of social issues. A 50-minute time period is usually enough for the participant to complete each questionnaire.

Participation in this study is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your relationship with your department. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw your consent and discontinue participation at any time without penalty.

Results of this project will not report the responses of any one individual, but will utilize group averages and statistics. All data collected for this study become the

property of the researcher. Any information that is obtained in connection with this study will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission.

This will be the first study to examine differences and/or similarities between the university students of these two cultures in terms of reasoning skills. Therefore, by participating in this study you are contributing to the literature regarding cultural differences. The only potential risk to participants in this project is the potential loss of anonymity; however, this risk is extremely minimal as subject names will not appear on any questionnaire.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me (Nilay Kuyel, [972-475-3541]) or my university advisor (Rebecca J. Glover, [940-565-4876]). You will be offered a copy of this consent form to keep.

Your signature indicates that you have read and understood the information provided above, that you willingly agree to participate, that you may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation without penalty, that you will receive a copy of this form.

Signature of Participant

Date

Signature of Investigator

Date

THIS PROJECT HAS BEEN REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY THE UNT
COMMITTEE FOR THE PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS (Phone: 940-565-
3940).

Katılımcı İstek Formu

Sayın Katılımcı,

North Texas Üniversitesi'nin, "Danışmanlık, İnsan Gelişimi ve Yüksek Eğitim Bölümü"nde yüksek lisans öğrencisiyim. Farklı kültürlerden gelen kişilerin, çeşitli sosyal olaylar karşısında nasıl fikir yürüttüklerini incelemeye yönelik bir araştırma yapmaktayım.

Bu araştırmanın temel amacı, Türk ve Amerikan üniversite öğrencilerinin, olaylar karşısında genel olarak nasıl fikir yürüttüklerini incelemektir. Bu çalışmada sizden, çeşitli sosyal olaylara ilişkin bilgi, tutum ve görüşleri belirlemek amacıyla hazırlanmış iki anketi doldurmanız beklenmektedir. Bu anketler yabancı kaynaklardan çevrilmiştir. Bu nedenle, özel isimler orijinal halleriyle bırakılmıştır. Sizden istenilen şey, hikayelerdeki kahramanlar hangi isimde ve hangi kültüre mensup olursa olsun, kendinizi onların yerine koyup, sizin kendi görüşlerinizi bildirmanızdır. Anketlerden her biri yaklaşık 40 dakika sürmektedir. Bu çalışmaya katılmak, isteğe bağlıdır.

Bu projede, katılımcıların kimlikleri ve bireysel cevapları gizli kalacaktır. Araştırma sonunda, hiçbir katılımcının bireysel cevapları hakkında bilgi verilmeyecek; elde edilen tüm bilgiler, grup ortalamalarını belirleme ve istatistik çalışmaları yapma amacıyla yönelik olarak kullanılacaktır.

Bu çalışma, Türk ve Amerikan kültürlerine mensup üniversite öğrencilerini "fikir yürütme becerileri" açısından inceleyen yeni bir çalışmadır. Bu nedenle, bu çalışmaya katılmakla, kültürel farklılıklara ilişkin literatüre katkıda bulunmaktasınız. Türkiye'de Hacettepe, Ankara ve Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi Öğrencileri; Amerika'da ise,

North Texas Üniversitesi Öğrencileri araştırmaya dahil edilmiştir. Anketler size uygulandığı şu sıralar, belli bir grup Amerikalı öğrenci üzerinde de uygulanmaktadır. Araştırma sonuçları, proje tamamlandıktan sonra (önümüzdeki sonbaharda) size de bildirilecektir.

Görüşlerinizi içtenlikle belirtmeniz, araştırmanın güvenilirliği açısından büyük bir önem taşımaktadır. Buna özen göstereceğiniz ve araştırmaya katkıda bulunacağınız için çok teşekkür ederim.

Bu araştırmaya yönelik sorularınız olursa, beni veya danışmanımı aramaktan çekinmeyin.

Nilay Özkan Küyel (Araştırmacı):

Doç. Dr. Rebecca J. Glover (Araştırma

Danışmanı):

Tel: (972) 475-3541

Tel: (940) 565-4876

Aşağıdaki imzanız, yukarıda verilen bilgiyi okuduğunuzu ve araştırmaya isteyerek katıldığınızı göstermektedir.

Katılımcının imzası

Tarih

Araştırmacının imzası

Tarih

Bu proje, katılımcıların korunması amacıyla, North Texas Üniversitesi Komitesi tarafından incelenmiş ve onaylanmıştır. [Tel: (940) 565-3940]

Demographic Questionnaire

Please complete the information below:

Major: _____

Please indicate the number of credit hours you have completed: _____

Please circle your classification: Freshman Sophomore Junior Senior

Age: _____ Birthdate: _____

Gender (circle one): Female Male

Number of siblings: _____

Where are you from? State: _____ City: _____

Town: _____

Marital status (circle one): Married Single Divorced Widowed

Family income (yearly):\$ _____

Father's level of education (circle highest grad completed):

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

completed some college

completed a Bachelors degree

completed some graduate work

completed a Masters degree

completed a doctoral degree (PhD, EdD, MD, etc.)

Father's occupation: _____

Mother's level of education (circle highest grad completed):

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

completed some college

completed a Bachelors degree

completed some graduate work

completed a Masters degree

completed a doctoral degree (PhD, EdD, MD, etc.)

Mother's occupation: _____

Parents' marital status: Never married Married Divorced Widowed

If your parents are divorced or one of your parents is widowed, how old were you when that happened? _____

Kişisel Bilgi Formu

Lütfen aşağıdaki soruları cevaplayınız.

Okul: _____

Bölüm: _____

Sınıf: _____

Yaş: _____

Cinsiyet: _____

Kardeş sayısı: _____

Yurdun hangi kesiminden geliyorsunuz? (Aşağıdaki uygun seçeneğin yanına çarpı işareti koyunuz.)

Şehir: Kasaba: Köy:

Bölge adı: _____

Medeni durum: (Aşağıdaki uygun seçeneğin yanına çarpı işareti koyunuz)

Evli: Bekar: Boşanmış: Dul:

Ailenin aylık geliri: (Aşağıdaki uygun seçeneğin yanına çarpı işareti koyunuz.)

Beşyüz milyonun altı:

Beşyüz milyon bir buçuk milyar arası:

Bir buçuk milyarın üstü:

Babanızın eğitim durumu: (Aşağıdaki uygun seçeneğin yanına çarpı işareti koyunuz.)

İlk: Orta: Lise: Üniversite: Yüksek lisans:

Babanızın

mesleği: _____

Annenizin eğitim durumu: (Aşağıdaki uygun seçeneğin yanına çarpı işareti koyunuz.)

İlk: Orta: Lise: Üniversite: Yüksek lisans:

Annenizin

mesleği:_____

Annenizle babanızın medeni durumu: (Aşağıdaki uygun seçeneğin yanına çarpı işareti koyunuz.)

Evli: Boşanmış: Dul:

Annenizle babanız boşandı ise ya da ikisinden biri dul ise, boşandıklarında ya da eşlerden biri dul kaldığında kaç yaşındaydınız?_____

Defining Issues Test

The *Defining Issues Test* may be obtained from:

The Center for the Study of Ethical Development

University of Minnesota

206-A Burton Hall

178 Pillsbury Drive SE

Minneapolis, MN 55455

Measurement of Moral Orientation

The *Measurement of Moral Orientation* may be obtained from:

Dr. Deborah Liddell

Associate Professor

Division of Counseling, Rehabilitation, and Student Development

The University of Iowa

N 364 Lindquist Center

Iowa City, IA 52242

APPENDIX B

Kohlberg's Stages

- Stage 1: Fear of authority and avoidance of punishment are reasons for behaving morally.
- Stage 2: Satisfying personal needs determines moral choice.
- Stage 3: Maintaining the affection and approval of friends and relatives motivates good behavior.
- Stage 4: A duty to uphold laws and rules for their own sake justifies moral conformity.
- Stage 5A: focuses on organizing a society by appealing to consensus-producing procedures (such as abiding by majority vote), insisting on due process, and safeguarding minimal basic rights.
- Stage 5B: focuses on organizing social arrangements and relationships in terms of intuitively appealing ideals.
- Stage 6: Abstract universal principles (universal principles of justice: the equality of human rights and respect for the dignity of human beings as individual persons) that are valid for all humanity guide moral decision-making.

REFERENCES

- Arat, Y. (1994). Toward a democratic society: The women's movement in Turkey in the 1980s. *Women's Studies Int. Forum*, 17, 241-248.
- Arat, Z. F. (1994). Kemalism and Turkish Women. *Women and Politics*, 14, 57-80.
- Attanucci, J. (1988). In whose terms: A new perspective on self, role, and relationship. In C. Gilligan, J. V. Ward, J. M. Taylor, & B. Bardige (Eds.), *Mapping the moral domain: A contribution of women's thinking to psychological theory and education* (pp. 201-224). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Baier, A. C. (1995). The need for more than justice. In V. Held (Ed.), *Justice and care: Essential readings in feminist ethics* (pp. 47-58). Boulder, Colo: Westview Press.
- Bebeau, M. J., & Brabeck, M. (1994). Ethical sensitivity and moral reasoning among men and women in the professions. In B. Puka (Ed.), *Moral development: Caring voices and women's moral frames* (pp. 240-259). New York, NY: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- Beller, J. & Stoll, S. K. (1995). Moral reasoning of high school student athletes and general students: An empirical study versus personal testimony. *Pediatric Exercise Science*, 7, 352-363.
- Blatt, M. M., & Kohlberg, L. (1975). The effects of classroom moral discussion upon children's level of moral judgment. *Journal of Moral Education*, 4, 129-161.
- Brown, L. M., Tappan, M. B., & Gilligan, C. (1995). Listening to different voices. In W. M. Kurtines & J. L. Gewirtz (Eds.), *Moral development: An introduction* (pp. 311-335). Needham Heights, Mass: Allyn & Bacon.
- Brown, L. M., Tappan, M. B., Gilligan, C., Miller, B. A., & Argyris, D. E. (1994). Reading for self and moral voice: A method for interpreting narratives of real-life moral conflict and choice. In B. Puka (Ed.), *Moral development: Caring voices and women's moral frames* (pp. 161-189). New York, NY: Garland Publishing, Inc.

- Brown, L. M., & Gilligan, C. (1992). *Meeting at the crossroads: Women's psychology and girls' development*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Candee, D. (1976). Structure and choice in moral reasoning. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 34, 1293-1301.
- Carlo, G., Koller, S., & Eisenberg, N. (1998). Prosocial moral reasoning in institutionalized delinquent, orphaned, and noninstitutionalized Brazilian adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 13, 363-376.
- Cassidy, K. W., Chu, J. Y., & Dahlsgaard, K. K. (1997). Preschoolers' ability to adopt justice and care orientations to moral dilemmas. *Early Education and Development*, 8, 419-434.
- Cesur, S. (1997). *The relationship between cognitive and moral development*. Unpublished master's thesis, Bogazici University, Istanbul, Turkey.
- Chodorow, N. (1978). *The reproduction of mothering: Psychoanalysis and the sociology of gender*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press.
- Colby, A., & Damon, W. (1994). Listening to a different voice: A review of Gilligan's *In a Different Voice*. In B. Puka (Ed.), *Moral development: Caring voices and women's moral frames* (pp. 275-283). New York, NY: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- Colby, A., Kohlberg, L., & Kauffman, K. (1987). Theoretical introduction to the measurement of moral judgment. In A. Colby & L. Kohlberg (Eds.), *The measurement of moral judgment* (pp. 1-61). Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Colby, A., Kohlberg, L., Gibbs, J., & Lieberman, M. (1987). A longitudinal study of moral judgment in U.S. males. In A. Colby & L. Kohlberg (Eds.), *The measurement of moral judgment* (pp. 77-117). Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Colby, A., Kohlberg, L., Snarey, J., & Reimer, J. (1987). The development of moral reasoning among Kibbutz adolescents: A longitudinal study. In A. Colby & L. Kohlberg (Eds.), *The measurement of moral judgment* (pp. 129-149). Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Denney, N. W. & Duffy, D. M. (1974). Possible environmental causes of stages in moral reasoning. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 125, 277-283.

- Edwards, C. P. (1986). Cross-cultural research on Kohlberg's stages. The basis for consensus. In S. Modgil & C. Modgil (Eds.), *Lawrence Kohlberg: Consensus and controversy* (pp. 419-430). London: The Falmer Press.
- Eisenberg, N., Miller, P. A., Shell, R., McNalley, S., & Shea, C. (1994). Prosocial development in adolescence: A longitudinal study. In B. Puka (Ed.), *Moral development: Reaching out* (pp. 1- 9). New York, NY: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- Eisenberg, N., Carlo, G., Murphy, B., & Van Court, P. (1995). Prosocial development in late adolescence: A longitudinal study. *Child Development*, 66, 1179-1197.
- Ford, M. R. & Lowery, C. R. (1986). Gender differences in moral reasoning: A comparison of the use of justice and care orientations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50, 777-783.
- Fraenkel, J. R. (1977). *How to teach about values: An analytic approach*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Friedman, W. J., Robinson, A. B., & Friedman, B. L. (1994). Sex differences in moral judgments?: A test of Gilligan's theory. In B. Puka (Ed.), *Moral development: Caring voices and women's moral frames* (pp. 285-294). New York, NY: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- Galbraith, R. E., & Jones, T. M. (1976). *Moral reasoning: A teaching handbook for adapting Kohlberg to the classroom*. Mpls., MN: Greenhaven Press Inc.
- Gardner, E. M. (1983). *Moral education for the emotionally disturbed early adolescent: An application of Kohlbergian techniques and spiritual principles*. Massachusetts: Lexington Books.
- Garmon, L. C., Basinger, K., Gregg, V. R., & Gibbs, J. (1996). Gender differences in stage and expression. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 42, 418-437.
- Gielen, U. P., Cruickshank, H., Johnston, A. F., Swanzey, B., & Avellani, J. (1986). The development of moral reasoning in Belize, Trinidad-Tobago, and the U.S.A. *Behavior Science Research*, 20, 178-207.
- Gielen, U. P. & Markoulis, D. C. (1994). Preference for principled moral reasoning: A developmental and cross-cultural perspectives. In L. L. Adler & U. P. Gielen (Eds.), *Cross-cultural topics in psychology* (pp. 73-87). Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Gielen, U. P. (1996). Moral reasoning in cross-cultural perspective: A review of Kohlbergian research. *World Psychology*, 2, 313-333.

- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Gilligan, C. (1988). Adolescent development reconsidered. In C. Gilligan, J. V. Ward, J. M. Taylor, & B. Bardige (Eds.), *Mapping the moral domain: A contribution of women's thinking to psychological theory and education* (pp. vii-xxxix). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gilligan, C. (1988). Remapping the moral domain: New images of self in relationship. In C. Gilligan, J. V. Ward, J. M. Taylor, & B. Bardige (Eds.), *Mapping the moral domain: A contribution of women's thinking to psychological theory and education* (pp. 3-20). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gilligan, C. (1995). Moral orientation and moral development. In V. Held (Ed.), *Justice and care: Essential readings in feminist ethics* (pp. 31-46). Boulder, Colo: Westview Press.
- Gilligan, C., & Attanucci, J. (1988). Two moral orientations. In C. Gilligan, J. V. Ward, J. M. Taylor, & B. Bardige (Eds.), *Mapping the moral domain: A contribution of women's thinking to psychological theory and education* (pp. 73-86). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gilligan, C., & Wiggins, G. (1988). The origins of morality in early childhood relationships. In C. Gilligan, J. V. Ward, J. M. Taylor, & B. Bardige (Eds.), *Mapping the moral domain: A contribution of women's thinking to psychological theory and education* (pp. 111-138). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hekman, S. J. (1995). *Moral voices and moral selves: Carol Gilligan and feminist moral theory*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Held, V. (1993). *Feminist morality: Transforming culture, society, and politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hersh, R. H. (1979). *Promoting moral growth: From Piaget to Kohlberg*. New York: Longman.
- Hersh, R. H., Miller, J. P., & Fielding, G. D. (1980). *Models of moral education: An appraisal*. NY: Longman Inc.
- Hoffman, M. L. (1994). The contribution of empathy to justice and moral judgment. In B. Puka (Ed.), *Moral development: Reaching out* (pp. 161-192). New York, NY: Garland Publishing, Inc.

- Jadack, R. A., Hyde, J. S., Moore, C. F., & Keller, M. L. (1995). Moral reasoning about sexually-transmitted diseases. *Child Development*, 66, 167-177.
- Jaggar, A. M. (1991). Feminist ethics: Projects, problems, prospects. In C. Card (Ed.), *Feminist ethics* (pp. 78-101). Lawrence, Kan: University Press of Kansas.
- Johnston, D. K. (1988). Adolescent's solutions to dilemmas in fables: Two moral orientations—Two problem solving strategies. In C. Gilligan, J. V. Ward, J. M. Taylor, & B. Bardige (Eds.), *Mapping the moral domain: A contribution of women's thinking to psychological theory and education* (pp. 49-72). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Koehn, D. (1998). *Rethinking feminist ethics: Care, trust, and empathy*. NY: Routledge.
- Kohlberg, L. (1976). Moral stages and moralization. In T. Lickona (Ed.), *Moral development and behavior* (pp. 31-53). NY: Holt, Rinehart, Winston.
- Kohlberg, L. (1981). *The philosophy of moral development: Moral stages and the idea of justice*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Kohlberg, L. (1982). The cognitive-developmental approach to moral education. In A. S. Alschuler (Ed.), *Values concepts and techniques* (pp. 18-35). Washington, DC: National Education Association.
- Kohlberg, L. (1994). The claim to moral adequacy of a highest stage of moral judgment. In B. Puka (Ed.), *Moral development: The great justice debate* (pp. 2-18). New York, NY: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- Kozan, M. K. & Ergin, C. (1998). Preference for third party help in conflict management in the United States and Turkey: An experimental study. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 29, 525-539.
- Kurtines, W. & Greif, E. B. (1974). The development of moral thought: Review and evaluation of Kohlberg's approach. *Psychological Bulletin*, 81, 453-470.
- Kurtines, W. M., & Gewirtz, J. L. (1995). Cognitive developmental perspectives. In W. M. Kurtines & J. L. Gewirtz (Eds.), *Moral development: An introduction* (pp. 17-25). Needham Heights, Mass: Allyn & Bacon.
- Kutnick, P. (1986). The relationship of moral judgment and moral action: Kohlberg's theory, criticism and revision. In S. Modgil & C. Modgil (Eds.), *Lawrence Kohlberg: Consensus and controversy* (pp. 125-148). Philadelphia, PA: The Falmer Press.

- Lapsley, D. K. (1996). *Moral psychology*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Li, C. (1994). The Confucian concept of Jen and the feminist ethics of care: A comparative study. *Hypatia*, 9, 70-90.
- Lickona, T. (1991). *Educating for character: How our schools can teach respect and responsibility*. NY: Bantam Books.
- Liddell, D. L., Halpin, G., & Halpin, W. G. (1992). The Measure of Moral Orientation: Measuring the ethics of care and justice. *Journal of College Student Development*, 33, 325-330.
- Litvack-Miller, W., McDougal, D., & Romney, D. M. (1997). The structure of empathy during middle childhood and its relationship to prosocial behavior. *Genetic, Social, and Genetic Psychology Monographs*, 123, 303-324.
- Locke, D. (1994). Cognitive stages or developmental phases? A critique of Kohlberg's stage-structural theory of moral reasoning. In B. Puka (Ed.), *Moral development: The great justice debate* (pp. 104-118). New York, NY: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- Lollis, S., Ross, H., & Leroux, L. (1996). An observational study of parents' socialization of moral orientation during sibling conflicts. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 42, 475-494.
- Lyons, N. P. (1988). Two perspectives: On self, relationships, and morality. In C. Gilligan, J. V. Ward, J. M. Taylor, & B. Bardige (Eds.), *Mapping the moral domain: A contribution of women's thinking to psychological theory and education* (pp. 21-48). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lyons, B. E. (1996). *Understanding convergence and divergence in identity and gender: Insights from the work of Carol Gilligan and a Turkish case*. Unpublished master's thesis, the Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Ma, H. K., & Cheung, C. K. (1996). A cross-cultural study of moral stage structure in Hong Kong, Chinese, English, and Americans. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 27, 700-713.
- Meyers, D. T., & Kittay, E. F. (1987). Introduction. In E. F. Kittay & D. T. Meyers (Eds.), *Women and moral theory* (pp. 3-16). Totowa, New Jersey: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.

- Miller, J. G. (1994). Cultural diversity in the morality of caring: Individually oriented versus duty-based interpersonal moral codes. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 28, 3-37.
- Moon, Y. L. (1986). A review of cross-cultural studies on moral judgment development using the Defining Issues Test. *Behavior Science Research*, 20, 147-177.
- Narvaez, D. & Rest, J. (1995). The four components of acting morally. In W. M. Kurtines & J. L. Gewirtz (Eds.), *Moral development: An introduction* (pp. 385-399). Needham Heights, Mass: Allyn & Bacon.
- Neff, K. D. (2001). Judgments of personal autonomy and interpersonal responsibility in the context of Indian spousal relationships: An examination of young people's reasoning in Mysore, India. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 19, 233-257.
- Niemczynski, A., Czyzowska, D., Pourkos, M., & Mirski, A. (1994). The Cracow study with Kohlberg's moral judgment interview: Data pertaining to the assumption of cross-cultural validity. In B. Puka (Ed.), *Moral development: New research in moral development* (pp. 347-357). New York, NY: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- Nisan, M., & Kohlberg, L. (1982). Universality and cross-cultural variation in moral development: A longitudinal and cross-cultural study in Turkey. *Child Development*, 53, 865-876.
- Park, J. Y. & Johnson, R. C. (1984). Moral development in rural and urban Korea. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 15, 35-46.
- Phalet, K. & Claeys, W. (1993). A comparative study of Turkish and Belgian youth. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 24, 319-343.
- Puka, B. (1994). Altruism and moral development. In B. Puka (Ed.), *Moral development: Reaching out* (pp. 315-334). New York, NY: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- Rest, J. (1986). *Manual for the Defining Issues Test: An objective test of moral judgment development* (3rd ed.). Minneapolis: Minnesota Moral Research Projects.
- Rest, J. R. (1997). Epilogue: Larry Kohlberg remembered. *World Psychology*, 2, 413-435.
- Rest, J. & Narvaez, D. (1998). *Supplement to guide for DIT-1*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

- Rest, J., Narvaez, D., Bebeau, M. J., & Thoma, S. J. (1999). *Postconventional moral thinking: A Neo-Kohlbergian approach*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Rich, J. M., & DeVitis, J. L. (1985). *Theories of moral development*. Springfield, Ill: C. C. Thomas.
- Selman, R. L. (1971). The relation of role taking to the development of moral judgment in children. *Child Development*, 42, 79-91.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1990). Individualism-collectivism: Critique and proposed refinements. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 21, 139-157.
- Shweder, R. A., Mahapatra, M., & Miller, J. G. (1990). Culture and moral development. In J. W. Stigler, R. A. Shweder, & G. Herdt (Eds.), *Cultural psychology* (pp. 130-204). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Shweder, R. A., & Haidt, J. (1994). The future of moral psychology: Truth, intuition, and the pluralist way. In B. Puka (Ed.), *Moral development: Reaching out* (pp. 336-341). New York, NY: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- Siegel, H. (1986). On using psychology to justify judgments of moral adequacy. In S. Modgil & C. Modgil (Eds.), *Lawrence Kohlberg: Consensus and controversy* (pp. 65-78). Philadelphia, PA: The Falmer Press.
- Snarey, J. R. (1985). Cross-cultural universality of social-moral development: A critical review of Kohlbergian research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 97, 202-232.
- Spiecker, B. (1994). Education and the moral emotions. In B. Puka (Ed.), *Moral development: Reaching out* (pp. 283-303). New York, NY: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- Stander, V. & Jensen, L. (1993). The relationship of value orientation to moral cognition: Gender and cultural differences in the United States and China explored. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 24, 42-52.
- Sugarman, S. (1987). *Piaget's construction of the child's reality*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Tolunay, A. (2001). *The relationship between religiosity, dogmatism, and moral reasoning*. Unpublished master's thesis, Bogazici University, Istanbul, Turkey.

- Tronto, J. C. (1994). Beyond gender difference to a theory of care. In B. Puka (Ed.), *Moral development: Caring voices and women's moral frames* (pp. 504-523). New York, NY: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- Tronto, J. C. (1995). Women and caring: What can feminists learn about morality from caring? In V. Held (Ed.), *Justice and care: Essential readings in feminist ethics* (pp. 101-115). Boulder, Colo: Westview Press.
- Turiel, E. (1998). The development of morality. In W. Damon (Ed.-in-Chief) & N. Eisenberg (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 3. Social, emotional, and personality development* (5th ed., pp. 863-932). NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Turiel, E., Edwards, C. P., & Kohlberg, L. (1978). Moral development in Turkish children, adolescents, and young adults. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 9, 75-86.
- Turiel, E. & Wainryb, C. (2000). Social life in cultures: Judgments, conflict, and subversion. *Child Development*, 71, 250-256.
- Walker, L. J., de Vries, B., & Trevethan, S. D. (1987). Moral stages and moral orientations in real-life and hypothetical dilemmas. *Child Development*, 58, 842-858.
- Walker, L. J. (1994). Sex differences in the development of moral reasoning: A critical review. In B. Puka (Ed.), *Moral development: Caring voices and women's moral frames* (pp. 327-341). New York, NY: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- Walker, L. J. (1995). Sexism in Kohlberg's moral psychology? In W. M. Kurtines & J. L. Gewirtz (Eds.), *Moral development: An introduction* (pp. 83- 107). Needham Heights, Mass: Allyn & Bacon.
- Walker, L. J. (1996). Kohlberg's cognitive-developmental contributions to moral psychology. *World Psychology*, 2, 273-296.
- Walker, M. U. (1998). *Moral understandings: A feminist study in ethics*. New York: Routledge.
- Winkler, G. N. (1994). Two moralities? A critical discussion of an ethic of care and responsibility versus an ethic of rights and justice. In B. Puka (Ed.), *Moral development: Caring voices and women's moral frames* (pp. 260-273). New York, NY: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- Yacker, N. & Weinberg, S. L. (1990). Care and justice moral orientation: A scale for its assessment. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 55, 18-27.